The Nation

Vol. CVI NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 3, 1918 No. 2740

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

The Week

THE retention of Major-Gen. Tasker H. Bliss as Chief of Staff after his retirement for age will greatly disappoint the younger army officers. They have been looking to men like Gen. Joseph Kuhn for his successor, men who are of fewer years, more pliable, and more familiar with the modern warfare than Gen. Bliss can possibly be. It has been the experience in Europe that the coming of war necessitated a new deal in both the Staff Corps and the line, and it is apparent that there will soon be a number of changes in Staff Corps heads within the War Department itself. It would seem the more regrettable, therefore, that there is not also to be a new and more vigorous Chief of Staff. Even were such a selection made, there would be the question whether such an officer could free himself wholly from the red-tape system, which, as Gen. Crozier admitted, still exists despite the fact that some slashing has been done since the war began. But if there is to be a house-cleaning at all, it will be a great pity if it is not thoroughgoing and does not bring to the front everywhere younger and more energetic men. Gen. Pershing knew what he was about when he asked the War Department to send no general to him who was above the age of forty-five.

ADMIRAL JELLICOE'S departure from the place of First Sea Lord by way of elevation to the House of Lords is less open than usual to the interpretation, for similar instances, of being kicked upstairs. The "very distinguished services" for which he is raised to the peerage have much more truth than the common formula in such cases. Jellicoe has, indeed, rendered distinguished services to his country and the cause of the Allies. More, undoubtedly, has been expected of him; the immediate cause of his departure is probably the repetition of German raids in the North Sea. But if we look to the essential service which was expected of army and naval commanders at the outbreak of the war, Admiral Jellicoe has fulfilled his duty more efficiently than any other war leader on either side, with the possible exception of Marshal Joffre. The German army, like the British navy, had its mission. The German army was to beat down the enemy armies, to take Paris, to compel a German peace. The British navy was to hold the seas and permit the unfolding of Allied strength on land. The German army has failed. The British navy has not failed in its primary mission; and even if there was the more ambitious expectation that the British navy could starve the Central Powers into a peace, there has by no means been complete failure.

THE tactics of silent naval pressure, pursued by Admiral Jellicoe, are not of the kind to stir the imagination of the plain man, though even the least imaginative of Englishmen must have recognized what the navy was doing for England in keeping her virtually immune from the war horrors that have fallen on all the other belligerents, not excluding Germany. So, too, the defeat of the submarine, while easy enough to visualize in its importance, has not the dramatic value which a naval attack on German harbors would carry. The slow but steady progress to the mastery of the U-boat is revealed in the official submarine report for the week ended December 26, with 11 British vessels of more than 1,600 tons sunk. The first quarter of a year of the U-boat war showed an average of 21 large British ships sunk; the second quarter showed 18 ships; the third quarter less than 12 ships; the four weeks since then a slight rise to something less than 14 ships. It is not to Jellicoe alone that credit should go. The American navy can claim its share. If German hopes based on the U-boat were truly all that they professed to be, then America has been in the war in a very appreciable sense.

IN the first appraisal of the disconcerting effects of Russia's defection upon the situation on the western front, millions of Teutonic troops were visualized marching across Europe to crush in the Allied wall in France and Belgium. Some, with sharper eyes than normal, already saw these countless divisions, drawn up from the North Sea to Switzerland, waiting for the word to attack. Even so well-informed and sober an organ as the *Manchester Guardian* spoke, under the first shock of a possible separate peace, of what would happen when three million additional Teutonic troops were brought up to the western front. Within a day, however, the *Guardian* thought better of it, and spoke of a million and a half, with possible further reductions. Col. Repington now gives us a detailed examination of possibilities. He arrives at three-quarters of a million men as the maximum which a separate peace with Russia would enable Germany and Austria to throw against the west front or employ in other fields. This addition would cut down the numerical superiority of the Allies, but whence is to come the Teutonic superiority of numbers essential for victory? Col. Repington speaks of a "crushing superiority" as essential against troops intrenched and confident in spirit. As to German reinforcements on the west front in the course of the last three months, this British observer places them at just six divisions, which is rather far away from the countless hordes detected by the keenly imaginative correspondents.

THOSE clauses in the Teutonic peace proposal which concern the rights of political minorities and exclude discussion of these rights from the peace conference must be read in the light of actual Austrian conditions. A contest has been waged in the Dual Empire, ever since Emperor Charles's accession to the throne, between the lesser Slav nationalities, on the one hand, and the Hungarians and German-Austrians, on the other. The Emperor, at first, seems to have viewed favorably the demands of Bohemia, at any rate. He freed the Bohemian political prisoners soon after he came to power, in spite of a tremendous outcry from both the Hungarians and Pan-German Austrians. More recently, however, the outspoken sympathy of the Bohemians for

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Entente, their radicalism and insistence on real autonomy, and the trouble they have made in the Reichsrath, together with stiff Magyar protests against any partition of Hungary, have brought the Emperor into the conservative camp. Teutonic victories in Italy have also given the Pan-Germans a certain added weight in the controversy. By dismissal of his closest adviser, a Slavophil, Charles is now said to have made his peace with Tisza, real master of Hungary. The next step, naturally, would be to hasten peace in order to put an end, once for all, to Slav hopes. But will the Brest-Litovsk conference survive any such step, with the Ukrainians still irreconcilable?

THE London *Nation* of December 8 prints an extraordinary number of dispatches from prominent men approving of Lord Lansdowne's letter. Among those in accord with the principles he lays down are such peers as Buckmaster, Parmoor, Weardale, Sheffield, Denman, Ribblesdale, Earl Russell, Earl Beauchamp, with Sir John Barlow and others. Arthur Henderson reaffirms his hearty approval. Lord Gladstone thinks that Lansdowne was entirely within his rights, and that "history may give judgment for him," and Sir Walter Runciman, so long in the Cabinet, declares the letter to be "the most courageous and sensible pronouncement made by any public man during the war," "essentially humane, statesmanlike, and pro-British." In view of this remarkable poll it is easy to understand why Lloyd George did not fulminate against the letter, as it was said that he would, and as the American Tory press wished him to. You cannot brand a man either as a blunderer or a pro-German when he plainly speaks for so influential a section of public opinion as Lord Lansdowne evidently did.

THERE was no perceptible jar at twelve o'clock, noon, on Friday, as the country passed from private to Government control of the railways. We crossed that equator without a bump. The public would not have known the difference if it had not been assured that a tremendous event had occurred. In fact, the physical change effected was negligible. The roads and their staffs are to be kept intact and separate. The new Government Director-General proposes no magic methods. He merely starts out on the slow and painful road of inquiry by experts and decisions by those who have had experience. Steps will doubtless soon be taken to coördinate and simplify, but no great alteration in externals is to be expected. This is not to deny that the action of the Government will have a sweeping effect upon some aspects of the railway problem. For example, it at once put the matter of railway credit upon an entirely new footing. The instant rise of shares on the Stock Exchange was proof sufficient. Indeed, if we were living in the good old times of suspicion and abuse, we might already have heard the President denounced for lending himself to a Wall Street scheme. There may be, in fact, mutterings to that effect in Congress. But in general the taking over of the roads by the Government, as a war measure, has passed almost without protest.

MR. HOOVER'S statement in explanation of the sugar shortage was largely an amplification of his statement of December 15. Thus far in 1916 the Allies, who used to take 300,000 tons of sugar yearly from the Western Hemisphere, have taken 1,400,000; since the Food Administration was created they have taken nearly 360,000 tons with the Administration's assistance. It is evident that a sudden increase in the European importation, amounting to nearly one-fourth the total Cuban and American production, was certain to cause sharp stringency. Mr. Hoover declares that had he not come into possession of his limited powers of control, the selfish sugar interests would have used the continued European demand and the growing depletion of our stocks in such a way as to make the scarcity very threatening. Sugar would have risen to from two to three times its present price. For this he has some concrete evidence in the fact that the Administration induced sugar factories which had just made contracts at high rates to rescind them, and that "numerous prosecutions have been started against firms which have sold sugar at prices of from 15 to 20 cents."

PRICES could not be fixed by Mr. Hoover outright; he had to depend on voluntary agreements with the manufacturers; he thrusts at Reed and others who crippled the Food bill by declaring that even power to buy and sell sugar in large quantities might have made possible somewhat greater reductions than that achieved. The liberal price to producers was thought necessary, "after an exhaustive study" by Government agents in Cuba, to stimulate production; but though liberal, it was only 34 cents a hundred above the previous nine months. The refiners' profits were actually cut down by 54 cents a hundred over the rate for this period. In attacking his problem, Hoover and his helpers had to reconcile many conflicting interests—American, Hawaiian, Cuban, European manufacturers, cane-sugar producers and beet producers, and consumers; we ought not to grudge recognition of his achievement in keeping the price of sugar—now generally nine and a half cents—at a level one to one and a half cents below that it reached before he took his place. He now expects to reduce it in 1918 to eight and a half cents, or its midsummer price this year. Slight railway troubles and the difficulty of forecasting the Allied shipping capacity have added uncertainty to the general situation; but sugar has been distributed in America as available, has been kept moving to Europe, and has been kept below profiteering levels.

WHILE war pressure keeps most officials hard at the immediate grind, the junior Illinois Senator is predicting the national and international future with the far-sighted acumen for which he is noted. He assures gaping America that peace will bring the United States the alternative between going her own way and joining "by treaties and compacts with chosen foreign nations." The South and Atlantic Coast will rush to form an alliance with the British Empire for commercial welfare and national defence, and the West will hang back because of the huge armaments entailed. It must hurt such a follower of President Wilson as Senator Lewis that his piercing gaze does not allow him to prophesy anything nearer a peaceful league of nations than this. For himself, as a sturdy Westerner he already casts in his lot against the entangling alliances and bloated armaments. To Europe he vouchsafes the news that Socialism is going on to a radical division of property, and to the United States the tidings that oil and coal, railways and telegraphs, and other public utilities are on the way to public ownership. The Senator might spend his time on a series of such illuminating speeches, treating the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole course of events up to 2000 A. D. Such prophets are rare, especially at a time when other junior Senators are studying bills and attending committee sessions.

CONGRESSMAN HULBERT'S decision to remain in Congress instead of resigning to accept the post of New York Dock Commissioner is a tribute to the ghost of Republican control of the House. Deaths and resignations have reduced the small Democratic margin to the vanishing point; indeed, pending the special elections to fill the vacancies thus caused, the Republicans will actually have a tiny plurality. But their being in the saddle remains remote. The presence of several independents will prevent them from having a majority, and while Mr. Hulbert might have been succeeded by a Republican, owing to the reapportionment that has come into effect since he was elected, this is not likely in any of the other places to be filled. One Pennsylvania district has returned a Democrat as successor to a Republican who was elected last year, and who resigned after being indicted for irregularities in connection with that event. As soon as districts at present unrepresented have named their Congressmen, Speaker Clark in all probability will again look down upon a House narrowly but unquestionably Democratic. Even if the balance were tipped the other way, the change would be of no practical importance to the country. Committees would not be reorganized upon a new basis. It would mean only a somewhat larger share for the Republicans of places and perquisites of minor value.

A CORRESPONDENT of a Western newspaper is disturbed over the disappearance of nicknames for our public men. "Uncle Joe" is much rarer than formerly, and even "Teddy" is seldom seen, if often heard. Even these were a great falling away from the resounding phrases in which our fathers delighted—"Old Rough and Ready," "Fuss and Feathers," "Old Cock Eye," "The Little Giant," "The Mill Boy of the Slashes," "The Fox of Kinderhook," "The Tall Sycamore of the Wabash," "The Plumed Knight," "The Stuffed Prophet." Chicago still boasts her "Hinky Dink" and her "Bathhouse John," but these are a pitiful remnant of the political vocabulary that once included "Look Me in the Eye Now Cleary," "Blind Billy," and "By Dang Evans." Unfortunately for reform, it must bear the responsibility of having rendered some of the most picturesque of these appellations obsolete by retiring their owners from public life. But reform had nothing to do with the brief career of "Pansy" as a tag for our Secretary of War. We are not so responsive to this pleasant little diversion of politics. Even when the most conspicuous of our public men takes pains to call himself "Woody" right out, we refuse to follow his lead. Most discouraging of all, when a man gets a glorious designation like "Pitchfork," he ups and lives it down.

ONE of the many interesting racial movements which developed during the last few decades in comparative obscurity is that known as the Yeni Turan movement, or, to use its German name, Turanismus. A traveller in southern and eastern Russia writes that this sentiment for racial unity among all the Turanian races occupying middle and nearer Asia, among the Tartars, Kirghiz, and Turcomans, appears to be very strong. Turkey has, of course, been the head and centre of the new growth in race consciousness, and Constantinople the sacred capital towards which the neo-Turanians looked. Naturally, the Turks fostered such dreams on the part of their blood relatives. Seeing that preponderance in Islam was gradually being taken away from them, they concurred eagerly in the Yeni Turan movement for the purpose of reëstablishing their prestige. Our own times have seen a great revival of the study of Turanian languages, and an attempt to purify Turkish of its Arabian and Persian elements. Also a good deal of antiquarian effort has been expended on disinterring old Turanian history, customs, and traditions. So long as the propaganda remained in this merely Platonic stage, no objection could be registered by a smiling yet tolerant cosmopolitanism. But it soon led to the brutal chauvinism which forced the massacre of non-Turanian elements within the Ottoman Empire, the Armenians and Arabs, and earned the world's condemnation.

GEN. PERSHING has put a ban on romance by urging the Soldiers' Godmothers' League to cease its organized attempt to introduce into the American army the institution of Filleul and Marraine. He adduces as his chief reason that the correspondence between lonely soldiers in France and their godmothers on our side of the water would clog the transport of necessary mail and supplies. His secondary reason is that he does not want his soldiers corresponding with strange women. Perhaps he means to imply that information of use to the enemy might be obtained by spies in this manner. Perhaps he is thinking of the proprieties. In any case, the American army and people are to be robbed of a highly picturesque feature of the war. Men in the trenches are not to be set dreaming of fair unknowns; ladies of all ages are not to have the fun of petting some huge bear of a person three thousand miles away. Gen. Pershing has taken the joy out of army letters. On the other hand, he has reduced the possibility of disillusionment when Filleul meets Marraine.

THE death of Dr. Theodore C. Janeway in Baltimore is a grievous blow to the medical profession and to the country. The son of one of our most famous physicians, a notable consultant, of whom it is said that he could often diagnose a case by a single glance as if inspired, Dr. Theodore Janeway profited enormously by his father's great practice and the paternal teachings. But this was supplemented by his own unusual abilities, a modest and earnest personality, his high ideals, and his readiness for the hardest kind of professional labor. He had already built up a most lucrative practice when, three years ago, he gladly gave it up to accept the first whole-time professorship in medicine ever established either in this country or abroad. In Johns Hopkins he was doing a noble work for the advancement of medical knowledge and teaching. There is no doubt that his untimely death in his forty-sixth year was as much a sacrifice for his country as if he had fallen in the trenches. He is one of the losses of the war, for he had been exhausting himself in Washington in aiding in the organization of the medical forces in the cantonments and camps and had just returned from those in the southwest, where pneumonia has been so shamefully rife, when he himself fell victim to the disease, the seeds of which may well have been laid in one of the camps. Medical skill could not overcome its virulence: hence a loss to the profession and to humanity it would be difficult to overestimate.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The War and Peace Outlook

THE old year ended well with the announcement in the *Manchester Guardian* that the British Government would give a "serious and reasoned reply" to the German peace terms just as soon as the official communication was received, and that Lloyd George would go to Paris to draft that reply in connection with Clemenceau. It is impossible to believe that they will find the German terms acceptable as they stand. But there is every reason to assume that any serious and reasoned reply, if it shows wherein the German terms are unacceptable and what the Allies' objectives are, will bring us a long step forward towards a settlement of the war. The star of peace stands higher in the heavens than at any time since the Kaiser cravenly yielded to his militarists and sanctioned the horrible crime from which the world is in agony.

Lloyd George's decision was a clear recognition that the Allies are keenly alive to the danger of letting the Germans manœuvre them into a false position. It is in striking contrast to the apparent inability of our own Administration to interest itself in the German offer or to realize its significance. As for the Bolsheviki, these "wild men" have now accomplished enough to entitle them to serious and respectful consideration. If they really bring about the concrete statement of war aims which Lord Lansdowne desired, and Mr. Asquith approved, they will have put the old-fashioned diplomacy to shame. As both Lloyd George and Mr. Asquith have declared that it would be a crime to continue the war a single day after it is possible to obtain a peace satisfactory to the Allies, we may now be certain that the British Cabinet will accept this opportunity to see if anything can be accomplished before buckling down to another year of war, particularly as Lord Curzon has just declared that "the supreme test, the severest crisis, lies before, not behind us, and in the next six months we may be confronted with perils greater than any we have overcome."

It cannot be denied that on the military side it is a bad year for the Allies which is just ending. The breakdown of Russia is not compensated for by America's entering the war, for, in addition to Russia, Rumania is possibly making a separate peace, and Italy is unable to do more than hold her present lines. Our own blundering since entering the war is not reassuring as to rapid effectiveness—with all the scarcity of tonnage there are more than one hundred ocean steamers unable to leave New York to-day for lack of coal. Moreover, the conditions of the various bureaus in the War Department are so chaotic as to delay appreciably our immediate effectiveness. On the western front the menace of the most formidable German attack since 1914 approaches, and everywhere comes the spectre of famine nearer and nearer. England began on Tuesday an "S. O. S." week—Save or Starve these letters signify. The most important labor gathering ever held in England notified the Government on Saturday not only that the war must end with democratization of all countries and a form of internationalism, but "gravely warned" it that a "crisis is arising in the country and may break out," and that if food is not properly supplied to the families of laboring men "the workers of the land will no longer stand" the present conditions.

This recalls the statement of the American Winston Churchill in the New York *Times* on his return from Europe the other day, that the war has narrowed down to the question whether revolution will take place first in Germany or in Italy, France, or England. Finally, it cannot be denied that though there are high hopes of putting the submarine out of business next summer with American aid, heavy losses continue, and there are many wrecks further to decrease the available tonnage. Plainly, with the skies thus darkened, wise statesmen would be guilty, indeed, if they did not inquire if an honorable peace—not a pro-German one—is impossible at the present time before buckling down to the final struggle with the militarists, whose abominable philosophy menaces the world. But grave as this outlook is, we do not wish for a moment to convey the belief that the Allies are defeated or that the outlook is hopeless. In our opinion Germany's peace terms are a confession that she is *at the end of her resources, and knows herself beaten and humbled.*

How else can one explain the offer of peace terms which the Pan-Germanists denounce as treason to Germany, to her armies of dead, to all her ambitions; as constituting "a greater victory for the Allies than any they have won on the battlefield"? There you have the opinion of the German Imperialists and the most arrogant militarists—the very men against whom this war is being waged, the very men who menace the safety of Europe and at home bar the way to Germany's democratization. What clearer proof could there be of defeat, what clearer promise that their campaign for annexations and indemnities has utterly broken down like a weak trench attack under a heavy artillery fire? Herein lies the great hope of the hour that the war is drawing to its close, and that the German leaders know that the game is up and that they have got to drink the bitterest draught ever offered to German lips—only to face thereafter the spirit of revolution at home. They read the newspapers, too. What will they say of the account of the meeting of German and Austrian prisoners in Petrograd on Sunday to organize an international propaganda among their fellow-prisoners along the lines of the Russian revolution? "Let Russian freedom teach us to obtain a like freedom at home," said the Austrian officer who presided, and he actually declared that now the Czar had gone, "the dynasty of the Hapsburgs and the Hohenzollerns *must be overthrown.*" This from Germans and Austrians who fought in the Kaiser's holy war! Well may he shiver as he reads of this treason and watches the dawn of the new year, which, every one must pray, will bring about his downfall.

World Trade and Peace

TWO objections arise to the views put forth the other night by Mr. Frederic C. Howe concerning the interconnection of peace, world trade, poverty, and immigration into this country. One objection is that Mr. Howe's specific instances destroy his case. The other is that even if the evidence had been more fortunate, the case as a whole will not bear the strain put upon it. Said the Commissioner of Immigration in New York:

> Financial imperialism, the sending abroad of wealth, may be as evil a thing as military imperialism. We should adjust our industrial conditions so that our wealth may be distributed equally here, and so that there will be no surplus to send abroad.

Nearly all foreigners come to this country, according to Mr. Howe, because of poverty at home; and that poverty is caused

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BEREA COLLEGE BEREA, OHIO

by the exportation, into the poorer and smaller countries, of wealth for investment by the larger, richer countries, whose own masses consequently fall into destitution—and emigrate. Under this rule, Germany and France, from which we have had virtually no immigration, and Great Britain, from which we have had a comparatively restricted immigration, would be small countries with no world interests or investments. On the other hand, Italy, Russia, Austria-Hungary, and the Balkans, from which has come the great mass of our immigration, are rich industrial countries which have invested so much of their surplus wealth abroad that their own inhabitants have sunk into poverty!

Why was it necessary to go beyond the fact of poverty, which undoubtedly is the mainspring of immigration, into an analysis of poverty as the outcome of surplus wealth exported? Because, frankly speaking, exported surplus wealth, or financial imperialism, or colonial imperialism, or world trade—the phrases are interchangeable—had become very much the fashion in the decades before the war, and has so continued out of force of habit. It was part of the Socialist doctrine that capitalistic overproduction on the alert for new markets and surplus wealth in search of foreign investments were sowing the seeds of war by bringing the industrial nations of the world into a savage competition for control of colonies and backward peoples. And it did not need the Socialist faith to find confirmation in the history of the period. In Europe itself there was peace for nearly forty years. The wars of the time, with the exception of the Balkans, were in Asia and Africa—China-Japan, the Boxers, the Boers, Manchuria. The political crises which threatened the peace of Europe were apparently extra-European in origin—France and England in Africa, then France and England and Germany in the long series of Moroccan shocks. It was a time of enormous colonial expansion, a process which brought the United States into the rank of world Powers. What more natural than to assume that it was outside of Europe that the dynamite of civilization was stored? Peace could be assured only by devising some method for dealing with the conflict of national interests among the colonizing and investing nations.

Now, it would be absurd to deny that the competition of the industrially advanced European nations for colonies and markets has had its share in the present world tragedy. But the reason is not that there is something more inherently evil and mischief-working in colonial competition than any other form of competition. The Socialists have succeeded in imparting to world trade a sinister meaning which internal European trade or domestic trade is apparently free from. Yet once upon a time there were dynastic wars in Europe; also there were religious wars, commercial wars, frontier wars, wars of expansion within Europe, and wars of liberation. In other words, where conflict of interests and passions arose, without the desire to adjust those conflicts by reason, there was war. To suppose that if we did away with the peril of colonial competition or world-trade competition we should be doing away forever with war is an absurdity. The evil cannot thus be localized. If we say that the ultimate reason for the present war is the advent of Germany in the front rank of Powers, a growing, bouncing Germany needing and demanding more and more room in the world, then it is rather childish to say that if Germany's feet had had a chance to grow in Africa and Asia, the German arms and head and thorax and thighs in Europe would have remained at perfect peace with the neighbors. The human body grows simultaneously all over. If there was not enough room for the German newcomer, the pressure would have been felt all over; as, indeed, Austria felt it in 1866 and France in 1870. The cause of the war has been, not international competition in Africa or in China or in South America, but the fact that we have had no civilized method for adjusting international competition.

Taking Over the Railways

THE President's proclamation that, by virtue of the Congressional act of August 29, 1916, he would at noon on Friday "take possession and assume control" of all railways in the United States, marked so important a step in our economic and political history that it is highly essential first to understand exactly why the action was taken, and next to make clear exactly what the change involves. The reasons for the action are set forth by the President in a separate statement; the railways had already realized what those reasons were.

First, it had become doubtful whether the process of operating all the railways as a unit could be carried out with complete efficiency unless one central and supreme authority were superimposed. This was so, not only to avoid conflict of views and purposes among the railway managers themselves, but to escape friction with restrictive laws of the nation or the States. The Interstate Commerce Commission, in its alternative proposal for continued independent operation, had suggested suspension of the Federal anti-combination laws by Congress; but this could not have affected State laws—which, however, are superseded by the war powers of the President.

But beyond this question of authority, there remained the difficult problem of adjustment of earnings. "Unified operation," under whatever auspices, involved in the present circumstances very extensive diversion of traffic from some railways to others. Roads which ordinarily carry the larger part of the traffic moving would by this transfer lose a part of the business legitimately billed to them. In some cases, facilities of a given road might have to be concentrated on a single kind of traffic, to the exclusion of all others. Adjustment of earnings and profits, under such conditions, presented a problem almost insuperable if no higher authority than a private manager's committee was in charge. But the President, in exercise of his war powers, can follow the English war-time plan and guarantee every railway its just share of net earnings. Furthermore, since the railways were unable, in the face of our heavy war loans, to raise funds for improvements through sale of their own securities, it had already become evident that the Government would have to provide this money—whether through outright loans to the companies or through guarantee of their securities. But it was not easy to arrange this machinery except under the form of Government control.

So much, then, for the reasons behind the President's action. As for the actual change which Government control will bring in actual operation, that is a question on which much misapprehension may exist. It does not follow that there will be any change at all. The problem to be solved was that of a central authority over the present operating staffs. It is entirely reasonable to assume that the existing "Railway War Board," to whose efficiency the President pays a special tribute, will continue in charge, but with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the power of the Government behind it to surmount all incidental obstacles.

That no such purpose is contemplated as assumption of personal management by a public official, the selection of the Secretary of the Treasury as Director-General of Railways is sufficient proof. For Mr. McAdoo to undertake the technical duties which would devolve on a president of a united American railway system, and to do so while still attending to the war loans and the routine Government finance, would be unimaginable.

Some very important particulars of the plan for Government control appear from the President's proclamation. The Government expects to guarantee to each company such net earnings as will amount to the ascertained average of the three-year period ending with last June. The proclamation expressly states that nothing shall impair the rights of stockholders, bondholders, or other creditors of the railways to the payments justly due to them, and the President personally adds that the Government must see to it that the railways are kept in as good repair and equipment as when taken over. The paragraph in the proclamation authorizing but not as yet proposing similar control of street railway systems is apparently designed to cover a situation in which their new issues of securities would also have to be taken care of by the Government. For it is true of them, as of the steam railways, that the Government's war requisitions have largely excluded these companies from the money market.

There will remain for solution two large questions, affecting rates for traffic and wages of employees. The labor question will in some ways be the more difficult; it has been found to be so by the governmental managers of the English railways, who in the main have conceded all demands made by the railway unions. But the British Government has also largely increased rates, and it is hard to see how our own Director-General can properly do otherwise. If rates are not advanced, and very substantially, then the Government, with its present railway plans, will almost inevitably be saddled with a heavy deficit, through making up to the roads the full net earnings of the three-year period prescribed. This outlay would have to be paid by the taxpayer, whereas with higher war-time rates the shipper of merchandise would foot the bill, as is right under the circumstances. Even more important is the fact that, since higher rates would enable the railways to pay their own way under the war conditions, it would leave them in a position, at the end of the war, in which the period of transition to private control could be bridged with a minimum of danger.

Newlands and the Senate

THE death of Nevada's senior Senator deprives the country of one of its most valuable public men at a moment when he can ill be spared. None of the great problems pressing for solution is more vital than that of the railways, and upon railways Senator Newlands was admittedly the chief authority in the Capitol. His place as Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Interstate Commerce he might have owed to his being Chairman of the Senate Committee on that subject, but it was a manifestly appropriate appointment. The legislation with which his name is most closely identified is the act for improving arid lands in the West by the development of waterways. His interest in this general matter had culminated in the naming of a special commission for a comprehensive study of our waterways. For he saw things in their broad relations. Being an expert did not mean with him being one-eyed. He was accustomed to master the task committed to him, and then to submit an able report upon it. Here lay the secret of the kind of leadership to which in his third term in the Senate he had attained.

It is not a kind that at once impresses itself upon the public—nor, for that matter, upon House or Senate. A single speech may bring a Congressman more glory outside the House and more recognition within it than months of hard work. Ability to debate is more productive of promotion than oratorical displays. But the man who, without the faculty of expressing himself on the floor with special grace or force, yet knows how to wind his way to the realities of a question, has the judgment not to be deceived by this plausible error or that, and can be trusted to arrive in the end at a sound and practical conclusion, such a man may work in the dark for some time before even the mass of his colleagues discover the value of what he is doing. To Senator Newlands came the reward of public applause as well as the more restricted tribute of the confidence of his associates in the Senate chamber. Perhaps this was owing in part to the absence of towering figures at Washington. Still, it was something for a man whose talent consisted in a capacity for taking infinite pains to win the attention of the nation in competition with men so picturesque and forcible as Borah, La Follette, Poindexter, and Tillman.

Another handicap upon Senator Newlands, as many persons would have considered it, was the circumstance that he hailed from Nevada. One often hears invidious remarks about the number of voters represented by a Senator from Nevada as compared with the number represented by any other Senator. See, we are adjured, what a place that State of deserts and divorces fills at Washington! Well, if it filled a larger place at the Senate end of the Capitol now and then than many a State of many times its population, this was due, not to any Constitutional compromise that gave the little States as many seats as the big ones, but to its having had the good sense to send a man like Senator Newlands to represent it there. What Maine used to do with irritating regularity with every seat at her disposal, Nevada has done now with her senior Senator for several terms. Before Newlands was John P. Jones, also a man of ability and a Senator of prominence. Jones was a Republican, Newlands a Democrat. Nevada was evidently not tied to any party, but capable of taking a fit man where she found him. It would be pleasant to add that the change in the method of electing Senators made no change in Senator Newlands's chances for victory, but his experience was peculiar. He was elected first by the Legislature. As his term drew towards its expiration, he submitted his candidacy, according to the Nevada law, to popular vote, and was endorsed by a wide margin over his rivals, the Legislature subsequently carrying out the promise of the party platforms by reëlecting him unanimously. This was in 1908, but three years ago he had a plurality of only forty votes in a total of over 20,000.

It is not going too far to say that the Senate was created for men like Senator Newlands. Our forefathers, in their unabashed semi-democracy, deliberately made one house for representatives of the "plain people" and another for a steadier, more sedate set of lawmakers. Let there be one chamber for men who are willing to fight for reëlection every other year, men with the inclination to keep their ears to the ground, they reasoned, but let there be also a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chamber where men can work for the country for four or five years before having to turn their eyes from public matters to private fences, a chamber where men can look quietly at all sides of a proposal and in thoughtful, high-minded discussion come to a sober, unbiassed, and sound conclusion—a place, in a word, for statesmen. It is easy to poke fun at this conception and to ridicule the way in which it has often worked out. A place for Quay and Platt, you mean! A sound-proof room for the Aldriches and the Hannas! But the framers of the Constitution were not quite the fools that we of this smarter generation would prove them to be. They did not suppose themselves to be making a perfect instrument of government. They would have been satisfied, one may guess, with the appearance among Senators of a fair sprinkling of men who scorned the ordinary processes of politics, but thought it not beneath them to devote their days and nights to a study of public affairs. It is in the Senate that such men find their natural place.

News-Gathering Troubles

FEW readers of newspapers have any idea of the difficulties encountered in gathering and printing news during the trying period of the war. Yet what the news agencies have accomplished since August 4, 1914, is little less than amazing, when all the handicaps are considered—the trouble in transmitting to cable stations, the endless censorships, and the congestion on all the telegraph lines. The public takes it for granted that the news will be supplied twice a day, with regularity and certainty, and seldom gives a thought to the many men who have been collecting it, some at the risk of their lives. The very evenness and trustworthiness of the Associated Press service, for instance, make against full recognition. It is possible that if the service were not so good those responsible for it would be praised oftener.

Particularly satisfactory, on the whole, has been the service from Russia since the Revolution. The news of the Czar's fall first came by way of Berlin, but it was speedily followed by detailed accounts from Petrograd; and since then, despite the turmoil, there has been excellent reporting of all important events, with the exception of the trial of the former War Minister, Soukhomlinov. The negotiations at Brest-Litovsk have been covered remarkably well. Often when a correspondent seems to fail on a given piece of news, the fault is not his. It is by no means certain, when a dispatch is filed, that it will reach its destination intact. A censor may take out an important passage, while the crowding of the cable may mean a delay so long as to render the telegram obsolete. No correspondent has any certainty when his dispatch will be published. Delays of ten and twelve hours and longer are frequent; of two dispatches filed simultaneously, one may go straight through and the other be held up. Even when they arrive in New York, the troubles of the news services are not over, for no one can tell how overburdened the local telegraph lines may be. Thus a dispatch which comes in time for the New York papers often fails to reach Western cities in time for the corresponding editions, for, after being edited on arrival, it may have to be sent to no less than a thousand newspapers all over the country.

Nor are the difficulties of news-gathering confined to the actual physical limitations and the censorship. It is harder than ever to get public men to talk, or to give their views for expression indirectly. So much is at stake that few are willing to take chances. Hence a greater reliance upon such phrases as "it is said in official circles," "it is the opinion among high officials," "it is believed in the War Department." This device is deemed essential in order to give the country an impression of what the Government officials are thinking. Most Washington correspondents would say that if this form of expression were denied them they could hardly do their work. Such personal phrases as "I believe," "it is my opinion," would naturally not carry the same weight. In the case of the Associated Press this latter form of stating a fact or an opinion is barred out. On the other hand, the use of the Washington "camouflage" is not without dangers. An unscrupulous or careless correspondent can mask himself behind "it is understood by high officials" when the opinion is really his own; and an official who wishes to use a press service for a "trial balloon" can successfully hide his identity and responsibility.

Nearly every time that news has come of an impending German statement about peace, there has appeared a dispatch from Washington throwing on it cold water, on the authority of anonymous officials. They may be Secretary Lansing or Mr. Polk or some third or fourth-rank subordinates. We have no doubt that the Associated Press has in these cases properly recorded official opinion, but plainly the dividing line between such reporting and being used to diffuse a given impression for a set purpose might easily be overlooked. Yet every press agency would do everything in its power to avoid being used for any purpose not openly stated. The only exception would be such a case as that which occurred during the Spanish War, when the newspapers were asked to print the announcement that an American fleet was going to Spain. It was not intended to send it, but the Government desired to try out the effect of such an announcement upon Spanish public opinion, and the press coöperated in this *ruse de guerre*. It would be most unfortunate for the reputation of a news service if it should appear that it had been unwittingly misled by a group of officials. Both correspondents and press associations are loyally desirous of serving the Government; but there is danger that what would ordinarily not be permitted to pass, as striking at the integrity of the service, may be printed in war time, although strict loyalty to the third party, the reading public, might dictate a different course.

Every news agency endeavors to keep editorial expressions of opinion out of the dispatches, yet they will slip in. For instance, the Associated Press, in a dispatch from Washington, said of the expected Christmas German peace terms that they "must be appraised only at their face value." It stated that they were like those given out last summer, at which time, it asserted, "they were denounced as having been written purely for political purposes." Had these phrases been covered by the formula, "it was the opinion in Washington to-day," they would have been less objectionable; as it was, they were open to the suspicion of being pure propaganda put out for the purpose of prejudicing in advance the American mind against any German peace proposals. Whether this would have been proper for Government officials there will be two opinions, but there can be no doubt that the Associated Press violated its own admirable rules in thus carrying an anonymous expression of opinion. The case merely illustrates afresh the difficulty of collecting and writing news impartially.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some Reconstruction Proposals

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

THE German peace proposals to the Bolsheviki, whatever their fate or their value, are compelling statesmen everywhere to reëxamine their positions. It seems apparent that until peace comes, whether that be now or next year or in 1919, the discussion of terms will steadily be in order. Lord Lansdowne's letter made it possible for anybody in the United States and in England to discuss peace conditions without being charged with treason. Mr. Asquith's speech and the German peace terms confirm this privilege. When it is remembered that as late as last August Americans were forbidden to discuss peace under any circumstances, under penalty of physical violence and Government denunciation, this progress towards rationality is highly gratifying. If by any chance those amazing men, Lenine and Trotzky, have really started an official interchange of views which will result in eventual peace, they will deserve well of the world, even if they should be doomed to fall to-morrow. Already by brushing aside diplomatic conventionalities they have obtained what Lloyd George and Clemenceau would not or could not get—a clear-cut statement of German peace aims.

But in the discussion of peace terms which is now going on so widely, is there not danger that because of the extraordinary range and variety of the problems which present themselves we shall lose sight of fundamental principles? When the war is over, we shall be facing what is practically the reconstruction of the whole world; no nation but will be profoundly affected by the inevitable readjustment. Every subject people and every nationalistic group seeking self-expression will appear before the peace conference asking for independence or self-government—the Finns, the Poles, the Hindus, the Ukrainians, the Armenians, the Persians, the various Balkan nationalities, the Zionists, the French-inclined natives of Alsace-Lorraine, the Algerians, the Egyptians, and endless others. If we turn to matters affecting international rights and policies, there will be the much-mooted freedom of the seas; the right of the *Hinterländer* to access to the oceans; the right of all the great Imperialistic Powers to approach the raw materials of Asia, Africa, and South America; the question of new sea laws; the matter of colonies. All of these things are formidable enough, yet they touch not at all upon the vital question of a new organization of the world, that is, disarmament, the question of a League to Enforce Peace or an International Parliament or a Court of Arbitration—the Hague Court expanded.

In such an overwhelming embarrassment of questions, issues, and problems, it would seem as if there were but one safe course for commentator or statesman, and that is to fall back upon certain broad, general principles. It is related of Wendell Phillips that, being asked by a slaveholder how he would reorganize the South after Abolition, and being assured that it was impossible to do so, that freedom meant chaos, anarchy, and a state of affairs in which no white woman or child could live, he replied: "In this matter I intrench myself upon the principle of human liberty and leave the working out of details to Almighty God"—a faith which time has eminently justified. Are there now any general principles upon which liberal-minded men who wish to make impossible either the running amuck again of Germany, or of any other nation which may have its day of militaristic madness, can agree at this stage of the discussion? The following are some that suggest themselves:

First and foremost: The disarmament of all nations, which includes the abolition of universal conscription; an immediate and radical disarmament which shall carry with it the establishment of small armed constabularies, but permit of the maintenance of no troops trained for war, and shall provide for the abolition of all navies and of the private right to manufacture arms and ammunition.

Secondly: The establishment of free trade and the abolition of all protective tariffs. This involves freedom of the seas and of trade to all peoples of the earth without fear or favor or special or preferential rights of any kind.

Thirdly: The acceptance of Abraham Lincoln's immortal saying that no man is good enough to govern any other man without that other man's consent as the only sound guiding principle for the readjustment of national, international, and racial relationships. It obviously carries with it a referendum in Alsace-Lorraine as to the future of those ill-treated provinces.

Fourthly: The establishment of an international parliament and an international court, to which latter shall be submitted all issues between nations, dropping once for all the phrase about causes which affect the honor of a nation, precisely as courts between individuals are not in the least affected by the individual honor as such of those who come before it.

Doubtless to many readers these four principles will seem so idealistic as not to merit much discussion. Yet I find many who believe that if any one of them fails of universal acceptance when the war is over, then by that much will the millions who have fallen in this war have died in vain. They are the clearest road to the advancement of democracy, and they cannot therefore be waved aside as wholly impractical. We have witnessed in the last three and one-half years more amazing things happen in the life of nations than any one could possibly have dreamed of. We who have seen Czardom collapse overnight ought certainly not to close our minds to any possibility. Sane men everywhere have a right to hitch their wagons to stars as never before. Can we not all agree that if none of these four principles is accepted when the war ends, then the unparalleled sacrifices of this war will have been largely for nothing? For we shall have smashed German militarism precisely as Napoleonism was crushed a century ago, and precisely as the causes of Napoleonism were left untouched we shall leave untouched the causes of this international catastrophe.

As to disarmament, that is all-essential. Militarism grows upon the exercise of the military habit, and no nation, in my judgment, can escape it which goes in for a large military or naval class. To say with certainty that our democracy can avoid it because it has never been militarized is, as ex-Secretary Fisher has pointed out, absurd because we have never tried the effects of having an enormous professional officer class, the permanent hundred

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and fifty thousand of military and naval officers which our militarists say is essential, if we are to have universal service. The danger of trifling with this issue, of talking *partial* disarmament, is comparable to the discussions of a partial freeing of the American slave by purchase or otherwise. Immediate and unconditional emancipation was what Abraham Lincoln found himself unwillingly driven to by the hard facts of war and the harder facts of absolute justice. It is now perfectly plain that the responsibility for this war rests primarily with the three General Staffs—the Russian, the German, and the Austrian—and the three Kaisers, who were the tools of their militarists—with the chief responsibility resting, before God and man, upon the Germans. If there is to be partial disarmament, we shall simply be confronted with the old fears which have built up nations in arms and placed the power to make war not in the hands of parliaments or of peoples, but in those of irresponsible sovereigns and still more irresponsible cliques of military men. Gradual disarmament appeals no more than gradual prohibition or the curing of the habitual drunkard by limiting him to one spree a week. With armaments must disappear the right of the private citizen to manufacture arms and ammunition, which should be reserved for the state alone.

Already there is among the Allies suspicion of disarmament because the Pope, Count Czernin, and to a limited extent the Germans, are for it. That is quite natural. After what the Germans have done, after the criminal character of much of their diplomacy has been revealed to us, it is not surprising that people look upon every suggestion that comes from them as upon Greeks bearing gifts. But in this case, a moment's reflection shows that it will be impossible for a nation that intends to disarm to go about the job in a way to deceive other nations. Modern war, as we now realize, means the heaping up of *matériel* whose cost is in the billions. It would be impossible for Germany, if it reduced its army to twenty-five thousand constabulary, to store supplies for two million men, for that would be known in a hundred ways. No Reichstag could vote a secret budget for military purposes disproportionate to the army in hand without being questioned at once by the Socialists as well as by foreigners. No General Staff could pile up thousands upon thousands of aeroplanes, huge guns, tanks, reserves of barbed wire, and all the rest without its becoming known.

But the best insurance for small forces is the abolition of universal, compulsory military servitude, for it was that devilish invention of the Germans which has made possible warfare on the present hideous scale, that is, the creation of "nations in arms." Abolish this and you abolish the ability to build up a military power to dominate the world, if only because universal service is unpaid service, and no nation could afford year in and year out to pay high wages to a professional establishment approximating that which the United States will have if it goes to universal service, or that which Germany had in 1914. If that seems an exaggerated statement, may I remind the reader that when in 1913 the Reichstag voted a further increase of the army and much additional equipment, it voted not a tax levy, but a levy on a portion of the property of the individual citizen—an example that British labor unionists are now following in their demand for a 25 per cent. capital levy at the close of the war. At any rate, it seems perfectly plain that genuine disarmament forbids any chicanery or deceit by nations who do not wish to play fair. Finally, there can be no trifling with this issue and no compromising, for if any large group of professional soldiers remains, the danger of conflicts will also remain.

The second principle, free trade, is hardly less important than the first, for behind the military men, and counting upon their aid and protection in oversea ventures, stand those who seek special privileges abroad or desire special trading or manufacturing privileges at home to be secured by building Chinese walls in the guise of protective tariffs around their countries. By no means enough has been said about the absolute necessity of free trade when this war is over if the world's financial recuperation is to be rapid. Yet it is a fact that wherever there is a special restriction on trade it is coming to the front now as a special grievance to be abolished by the peace conference. Of this, the Turkish monopoly of the waterways to Constantinople is the classic example. Free trade lurks in the background of the involved discussion of the freedom of the seas. Proclaim it and you do much to make plainer "the great illusion" that colonies and spheres of influence are worth fighting for, just as when you abolish navies you do away with the chief excuse for such wrongs as our conquest of Santo Domingo and Haiti—urged by our navy as a means of protecting the Panama Canal.

To this it is no answer to point out that free-trade England has been the nation above all others to develop spheres of influence and to seize naval bases. What guarantee, it will be said, is there that if all the nations were similarly wise and generous in their tariff policies as England has been since Cobden's days there will be less land-grabbing and less seeking after special positions and trade opportunities? There can obviously be no such guarantees if democracy of the secret and slimy kind remains the governing spirit of nations. But the very act of throwing down tariff walls would clear the atmosphere, end many rivalries, and enormously advance the feeling that the nations of this little earth must share it on a fair and just basis of competition. It would be worth while if only because it would be another blow at that old absurdity that trade follows the flag. Best of all, it will take another element of unmorality out of the world, for I am of those who believe that a protective tariff is a distinctly immoral affair. Nearly fifty years ago an American who won honors in the battle for humanity wrote thus upon this question:

> For the cause of human liberty covers and includes all possible forms of human industry and best determines how the productions thereof may be exchanged at home and abroad to mutual advantage. Though never handling a tool or manufacturing a bale of cotton or wool, he is the most sagacious political economist who contends for the highest justice, the most far-reaching policy, a close adherence to natural laws, and the removal of all those restrictions which foster national pride and selfishness. There is nothing intricate in freedom, free labor, free institutions, the law of interchange, and the measure of reciprocity. It is the legerdemain of class legislation, disregarding the common interests of the people that creates confusion, sophisticates the judgment and dazzles to betray. . . . Believing that the interests of the American people in no wise materially differ from those of any other country, and denying the rectitude or feasibility of building ourselves up at their expense by an exclusive policy obstructing the natural flow of material exchanges, I avow myself to be a radical free-trader. . . .

The very fact that the nations of the world have been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able to raise the necessary funds for carrying on the war when their revenue from imports has either ceased entirely or fallen off tremendously is a severe blow at the theory that we must at least have tariffs for revenue only. If we disarm, we shall remove the heaviest financial burden from every nation, make possible the steady reduction of the hideous debts of the war and the carrying of the enormous pension payments which will result from the struggle, and shall make impossible the excuse that we must tax imports in order to get money to carry on the Government. No one thing would do more to tie the nations together in bonds of friendliness than the adoption of the policy of free trade throughout the world.

As to Abraham Lincoln's immortal words, if we stop now to apply them to the map of the world, what miracles take place! From the ardent, never-surrendering Poles drops the shameful yoke of Prussian and Russian intolerance, and the once unconquerable Persians will fling off the bondage of Russia and England. Egypt may hope to govern herself once more. In Finland, in Russia, in the Near East, new nations will arise. Tripoli will send back across the Mediterranean those Italian troops whose conquest of her soil a few years ago is the blackest chapter in modern land-grabbing. In Palestine, in Arabia, nations already arising will stand alone. The German colonies will be purged of unworthy masters. To enumerate all the changes is staggering: it is all overwhelming in its possibilities, breath-taking in its magnitude—too great, most people will say too nearly the millennium, too radical, to be possible even at the price of eight millions of lives. Perhaps yes, but who can tell? Who would have thought that Russian revolutionist refugees would not only be dictating the fate of Russia to-day, but insisting to Germany that she state proper terms? With so extraordinary a fact as this confronting us who have seen things in three years that men would have been locked up as insane for predicting, can we sketch out events that are too vast, or formulate a programme that is really beyond the range of possibility?

As for my fourth principle, the establishment of international government, by the creation of a parliament of nations and a judicial tribunal of nations, to say nothing of a league of nations, the time has surely passed for either elucidating the proposal or advancing arguments in its behalf. Discussion to-day deals with those who shall be included in its membership, how great the police forces it will require, etc., etc. By this time it must be plain that these four principles merge themselves into one: we must establish, as the Pope has put it, "the fundamental point . . . that the material force of arms shall give way to the moral force of right," which means simply that right and justice and not might shall hereafter govern this world. How far it will be justifiable to maintain troops to enforce the decrees of the league of nations, each person must decide for himself.

Much will, of course, depend upon the spirit of those who have to make the new peace and to reconstruct the world. A peace signed in bitterness and hate and continued in that spirit will be of dubious duration. We ought to forgive our public enemies as readily as we forgive the individual who commits a crime against us, but there is an ethical duty for public opinion to exact proof of German recognition of wrongdoing and of sincerity of conversion before the sinner shall be received as one entirely cleansed of crime. The outraged public opinion of the world may certainly be counted upon to take care of this; its attitude and that of the peacemakers ought not to be that of men seeking to punish the greatest crimes in history by robbery or by the exaction of impossible penalties, but rather of the judges of modern penology, who desire to impose only that penalty which shall most speedily restore the criminal to society as a useful, safe, and worthy member. Are there four better proposals to accomplish a lasting peace than those enumerated above?

An Unexpected Centenary—Suarez in French Politics

By STODDARD DEWEY

ONE of the oddest things in this strange war is the vehement objurgation of the French Government by the Socialist Deputy Poncet for an unexpected reason—which turned out to be the centenary of Francis Suarez. He declared that passports which had been refused to Socialists to go to Stockholm for a Congress of the Internationale, where they were to meet with German Socialists, had been given to Catholics to go to a Congress in Granada, where they had actually met with Germans. The explanation that it was not a Congress which had been held at Granada, but simply a ceremony in celebration of the third centenary of the death of Suarez, a Spanish theologian and philosopher, with an English bishop—doubtless with a British passport—at the head, was not accepted.

Paul Souday, who has to be omniscient to follow in the steps of Sainte-Beuve

—sequiturque patrem non passibus æquis—

discovered that Suarez must be the Jesuit theologian who, so Pascal says, allowed a Christian to sin twice a month! He does not seem to know that Bossuet, who was a Frenchman competent in the matter, cited Suarez as the master in whom *tota schola loquitur*. Huxley, some fifty years ago, when trying to prove to a Catholic opponent that Rome did teach the world was made in six mathematical days, was persuaded to open the appropriate tome of Suarez and burned his fingers with the Latin.

Yet two complete editions of the two dozen volumes of the Spanish thinker—for he was a thinker—were printed in Paris alone during the last half of the nineteenth century. The greater portion of them are not connected with theological squabbles at all—and they have helped greatly to build the Society of Nations which only now promises to enter its final phase. James I of England had the Latin books burned by the common hangman because they impugned the divine right of kings; and he complained bitterly to Philip III of Spain that he allowed such dangerous stuff to be printed. Unfortunately, the book had been written by express order of Pope Paul V—but this did not prevent the Catholic Parliament of Paris condemning it for King James's reason. In fact, Suarez is not far from saying that the authority of governments is derived from the consent of the governed. It was left for Leo XIII to reconcile his formula with St. Paul's text which Tudors and Bourbons relied on—*There is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God.* Man, says this modern Pope, is by nature a sociable animal and in his societies it is natural to have authority—and hence the powers that be are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ordained of God in so far as God is the Author of Nature.

However this may be, the influence of Suarez and Bellarmine and others like them had far-reaching political results. Lord Acton, who was more omniscient than the French critic, remarks that Rousseau's political thoughts are "old friends—you will find them in the Jesuit casuists dear to Algernon Sidney." In 1679, Suarez's giant tomes on Laws were reprinted in London itself. Grotius had already expressed his obligations to him and his reasonings are found in Puffendorff. Sir James Mackintosh, in his "Progress of Ethical Philosophy," which has long since been translated into French, paid tribute to this side of Suarez.

It may be merely curious erudition, but it may be added that, in matters of abstract speculation, many recent controversies may be found analyzed by this scholastic beforehand. One example is the distinction between the divisibility and measurability of quantity, which is at the bottom of disputes between Newton and Leibnitz, between Duhamel of our own time and the Geometers, in the fundamental understanding of the differential calculus. Even Huxley would have been agreeably surprised at the way Suarez handles the question whether quantity is formally or only virtually real; that is, outside of our thoughts; and our latest philosophers might profit by his unswerving distinction between the *conceptus formalis* or act of thinking and the *conceptus objectivus* or thought representing the object. To Paul Souday and Sainte-Beuve, perhaps to Pascal, all such might seem little else than Coleridge's "Sum-m-mjective—Objective," as Carlyle heard it from him. Yet it is something, now that the Society of Nations is dawning amid a war between powers that be claiming antipodal rights, for the Encyclopædia Britannica to acknowledge in Suarez the precursor of Grotius and Puffendorff. It might be added that the Spaniard's teaching of Right and Law has disciplined minds which the Dutchman and German never reached.

This is not quite what the Rector of the Catholic University Faculty of Paris, Baudrillart, had to say after he came back from Granada and heard of the Parliamentary attack. "Spanish Catholics would have been wounded if the French had abstained from joining in their centenary. There was no discussion at all of peace—Pope Benedict's Nuncio, who was there, would never have allowed any one to touch on so burning a subject. There was not one German's name on the programme—not one had sent a paper—not one had signed for the Congress, in which not one appeared." And yet?

When a final and special session was decided on, that each delegation might read its address, suddenly—*presto*—three young Germans issued forth and one spoke. His name was Bochmann, and all three were teachers in boys' schools patronized by the German Ambassador to Spain—Prince Ratibor—and all three were Protestants!

I wonder if they spoke in favor of the divine right of Emperors. I wonder still more that French critics and politicians should not know how half the French and Latin men around them live and think, witness the sale of Suarez's two dozen volumes.

Paris, November 1

The Selective Draft in College Entrance

By HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY

SINCE President Meiklejohn's proposal some years ago to turn the curriculum upside down by setting the freshman to studying philosophy and the social sciences, no more interesting suggestion has been put forward in college circles than the one contained in the annual report of Columbia's president for some sort of personally selective admission test. President Butler proposes that the existing examinations for college admission and the existing requirements of previous academic residence for admission to the professional and graduate schools be continued, but "solely for the purpose of creating an eligible list, from which eligible list would be selected, year by year, those whom the several faculties wished to accept for instruction and training." The one serious difficulty that President Butler sees in the plan is that "it requires labor, a faculty for decision, and a willingness to accept responsibility, which human qualities are no more superabundant within a university than outside it." Far be it from a humble college teacher to question such a dictum coming from such a source; yet the plan, as applied to college entrance at least, suggests certain doubts that seem worthy of consideration.

To understand the suggestion fully, it must be read in connection with other proposals of this same interesting report. Of the 1,200 students who at present tax the facilities of Columbia College, about 500 come with the idea of preparing as speedily as possible to meet the requirements of the University's professional schools. The remaining 700, to quote President Butler's language, "intend to spend at least three years, and probably four years, in the pursuit of those liberal and elegant studies which have long since established their primacy as instruments for the education of a scholar and a gentleman." The first group, according to the proposed plan, would be segregated in a Junior College separately organized. Having thus sifted out the utilitarians, and left only the 700 who desire to become gentlemen and scholars, President Butler would proceed to organize these latter into "a residential college in accordance with the best English and American traditions." He would limit the attendance of Columbia College to as many as can be accommodated in its residence halls, with a capacity of 600, together with a restricted number living in their own homes in New York and vicinity, or in registered fraternity houses. He would use the large available scholarship funds in such manner "as to attract to Columbia College the best type of American student from all parts of the land."

The proposal is thus to establish a college aristocratic in the best sense of the word—or to use a less invidious term, a distinctive college. As part of the general educational scheme of the United States, where opportunities for higher education are widespread, such a college has attractive possibilities, and the proposed selective admission requirements must be thought of in connection with the general plan.

The conditions giving rise to these proposals are not peculiar to Columbia. Struggling American colleges are trying to get students in, but colleges with great reputation and large bodies of alumni are trying to keep students out.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The problem of choosing among candidates who can meet the admission requirements is relatively new, and any new entrance plan must be judged chiefly on the basis of probable results rather than on the sure ground of experience. On this basis, what is to be said of the scheme of personal selection by a faculty committee or administrative officer, from an eligible list established by examinations either of the old type or of the new comprehensive variety?

The plan has undoubted possibilities for good. To select a group of unusual young men and put them together for four years under conditions favorable for the growth of the human mind and spirit is an attractive ideal. Any one acquainted with the best products of the English universities must recognize how much can be accomplished by a process of that kind, even where the students all come from a single social class. When one sees what Oxford and Cambridge have done for English scholarship and statesmanship, one is tempted to echo the remark of an enthusiastic Cambridge undergraduate that except for its class character the English university system constitutes an ideal plan for the training of men. Certainly American education to-day lacks distinction, and the selection of a well-defined type may well be a real service at a time when the product of the colleges tends to uniformity and facility, rather than to diversity and depth. The results depend in good part on the criterion of selection, which President Butler perhaps wisely leaves to his faculty, and on the administration of the scheme, which also depends on faculty wisdom. A wise faculty might accomplish great results.

The dangers of the plan, however, ought to be clearly recognized from the beginning. College entrance ought to be based on some test of capacity—capacity for what, may be discussed later. Examinations, at best, test not only capacity, but earlier opportunity and schooling. But it is hard to think of any kind of positive selection likely to be exercised by a college faculty among boys and girls at seventeen or eighteen that would not in even larger measure than examinations be a test of the candidate's family and social environment, rather than his capacity for anything but the amenities of social intercourse. The idea, of course, is that the entrance committee will pick out the rough diamonds, who will then rapidly acquire polish and cutting edge by rubbing against keen gentlemen and scholars. But is it not more likely that, with the best will and the most democratic intentions in the world, the committee will rather shut out the unlicked cub of some immigrant lion that has been busily roaming the forest in search of food, and so has let his progeny go to college without the glossy coat that constitutes so apparent an element in "promising personality" at eighteen? The danger, at any rate, is not to be neglected.

Positive selection, moreover, is too likely to become a cloak for negative exclusion—a means of keeping out groups that are not wanted rather than of getting in individuals that are wanted. It is no secret, for example, that many of Columbia's alumni and faculty would like to limit the number of Jews admitted to the College. The new plan would make this entirely practicable—and that, too, without any outbreaking scandal. Discrimination on social, religious, racial, political, or any other grounds may conceivably be defensible as a matter of educational policy; but unless a college is prepared to accept discrimination with all its implications, it does well to examine narrowly any proposed line of action that contains such subtle possibilities of discrimination, conscious and unconscious, as does this selective admission scheme.

A more serious danger inherent in the plan is that it may in fact decrease, rather than increase, the richness and the cultural value of college life by bringing into each college a single distinct type of student, rather than a diversity of types. Most thoughtful college men have profited greatly by association with fellow-students of widely different background from their own. Will not selective admission increase yet farther that tendency to uniformity and conformity which is already so pronounced and so undesirable a feature of life in most American colleges? To be sure, conformity at the present moment is ranked high among the virtues, and yet there was once a great American thinker who said, "Whoso would be a man, must be a nonconformist."

In this particular, the first available report from an Eastern college making trial of selective entrance is not wholly encouraging. Vassar College has been obliged to limit its numbers. President MacCracken quotes thus from the Committee on Admission: "The committee has determined to consider the results of the examinations of all candidates, their records during their four years of school, and in addition to these academic credentials all possible information about the candidate's personal qualities of character—an instinct for leadership, a law-abiding spirit or the contrary, special gifts in the arts, or any other qualities which may be positive assets in the life of the college." To seek "qualities which may be positive assets in the life of the college" is to recognize the cultural aim that the college should pursue, but one need not be an anarchist, or even an "intellectual Bolshevik," to wonder whether it is a good way of getting those qualities to select students on the basis of such evidence of law-abiding spirit as is available at seventeen. Would the Vassar committee admit only well-behaved young ladies? Columbia men will be not unlikely to recall a certain youth named Hamilton who for lack of a law-abiding spirit was separated from Old Nassau and then came to Kings College. After saving the Tory president of the College, he joined certain other lawless individuals who were guilty of setting up a new nation. To-day the Columbia undergraduate passes the statue of Alexander Hamilton as he enters the great hall named in honor of that statesman, in order to hear his professors expound the *Federalist*. A wise man does not select colts because they stand quietly in the paddock, rather than run about and kick up their heels. Is selective college entrance to mean such a choosing of human colts?

The danger of unwarranted discrimination and selection for conformity is enhanced by the ever-present influence of rich and powerful alumni. Influential alumni stand behind the proposals here discussed in the case of Columbia. Now, with all due respect, the alumni of an institution are generally wrong concerning its current problems. Every change made since their time, except for improvements in coaching the athletic teams, is always in the wrong direction. They want the college to be the same that it was in their day, and they want the students to be of the same type that they imagine themselves to have been. Their influence will almost always be exerted strongly for discrimination in behalf of their own type of student—and that in the most perfect good faith and loyalty to the college. But can college faculties afford to increase that influence so exerted?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Most important of all, however, is the doubt as to whether the whole theory of selective entrance is not based on a mistaken conception of the purpose of the college. We are in revolt against intellectualism, and there is a strong drift towards making the colleges training schools for gentlemanly citizens. In the present state of educational theory and public feeling, it may be temerarious to assert that the duty of the college, in a world as badly unbalanced as this one has always been in the direction of irrationality, is to turn out thinkers rather than gentlemanly citizens; yet a few of us still cling to that faith. That faith questions, not the value of culture, but its definition; it holds that real culture issues in active thought, not passive absorption. Training for citizenship is an attractive idea; in practice it is too likely to be, in the case of young students, training in social conformity. Training for thought is a more austere ideal, less easily justified in a day when thinking with the crowd adds to one's immediate serviceableness. But if the college is to maintain its place in the future, it must be by training men and women to think for themselves. And if this be the true function of the college, then it should select its students chiefly if not wholly on the basis of their capacity to become thinkers, so far as that capacity can be discovered at entrance. If any proposal for selective admission is an attempt at an improved method of making such intellectual selection in order to make the best possible utilization of limited resources, it deserves careful examination. It may in that case be a means of helping the colleges perform better their real function in a democracy—that of leavening the mass of emotion and irrationality with even a little independent and fearless thought. President Butler, however, gives us no evidence that such is the purpose of his plan.

Whatever the criterion of choice may be in the mind of the distinguished proponent of the scheme, it seems likely that the plan in actual operation will rest on a basis not primarily intellectual, but social, and social in a vague and ill-defined sense, so that the tastes and preferences of the moment, even the idiosyncrasies and notions of the examining committee, may exert an influence wholly out of proportion to their importance. It may be, if the plan ever comes into operation, that this danger will be avoided, and that college faculties will hold fast to their intellectual tradition both in choosing and in training their students. For the sake of the richness and quality of the American life of the future, it is greatly to be hoped that such will be the case. With our growth in wealth, we increasingly need a substitute for poverty to put the iron in the blood of the children of the well-to-do classes. The college might conceivably fulfil this function for the most able young people if its intellectual life were to be made intense and severe. But such a life is possible only for students who have been chosen on the basis of intellectual capacity. If any plan of college admission is to be merely a device for getting together a group of clubbable young men to hand down the social tradition of their fathers, for excluding youth who are held undesirable because of their racial or religious or social affiliations, for creating a homogeneous college group by assembling a company of able and respectable young gentlemen to be trained in the practice of intellectual and social conformity by the peaceful pursuit of "liberal and elegant" studies under the guidance of respectful teachers, then the less we have of such selective admission, the better for the college and the country. The ongoing movement of a busy world might indeed for a time leave such a college in cloistered aloofness as a temporary home for the elegant scions of the leisured class, too lazy to be active, and too well cushioned by their wealth to be uneasy. But when the college had thus demonstrated its uselessness, save for the ornamentation of decadence, it might confidently look forward to euthanasia, and its impecunious professors would be casting about for more remunerative, if less respectable, fields of labor.

Correspondence

A Rationale of Free Speech

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: To the many "reasons" for restricting speech and press during war times, Mr. Stowell, in the *Nation* of November 15, adds another—rationalism. Those who contend for a peace-time freedom of speech and press are charged with evading the "preliminary question of whether it is really rational to permit at this time the usual untrammelled utterance and unrestricted freedom of propaganda." Far from evading this question, I would make it the very basis for demanding an untrammelled freedom of speech and press.

In making rationalism or expediency the basis of a demand for free speech and press, it may be well to discriminate between real expediency and what appears to be expedient. The German military clique who determined upon the rush through Belgium and later dominated the German Foreign Office were no doubt actuated by expediency of a sort—"military necessity." With high scorn for their "irrational" critics, they drove on "to carry the war to a successful conclusion." Their "rational" plans carried in them the seeds of defeat. Our plans for bringing the war to a successful issue must not be of such a nature as to defeat their end—democracy made safe for all time. This calls for real rationalism, and it is in promoting this kind of rationalism that untrammelled freedom of speech and press are absolutely necessary at this time.

The objections to free speech are of a kind that reveals, on the part of the objectors, a disbelief in the ability of the "man in the street" to judge intelligently—a fear that, without a guardian of some kind, he will go wrong. Yet not only does a democracy assume his ability to judge wisely, but all the superiority democracy can claim over other forms of government is due to this very competence. The popular rule that distinguishes a democracy is justified only if the people are able to discern the truth more clearly and make wiser decisions than the smaller groups in other forms of government. If democracy cannot so justify itself, it is a failure, and has no right to ask for continued existence.

Just how much safer is the judgment of democracy than that of other forms of government, I shall not presume to say; but let us assume, for purposes of demonstration, that out of three instances democracy would make two wise decisions, while other forms of government would only make one. If, knowing this, one were to admit that a certain undemocratic policy might be justified, one would not thereby "confess that his principles are too imperfect to serve as a practical guide"; but merely concede that while such a measure *might* be justified, the odds are two to one that it would be most unwise and inexpedient. The odds in favor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of free speech and the popular control which it makes possible, are the odds in favor of democracy itself.

Now that we are in the midst of a great crisis, with the most momentous problems to solve, one is tempted to ask whether it is "really rational" *not* to permit discussion, and invite popular judgment upon the policies to be pursued. Are the defenders of democracy to be denied the protection of the system they defend?

It will be argued, of course, that "control" of speech and press will permit all proper discussion, but a moment's consideration of things as they are will prove this contention a fallacy. Control must necessarily be exercised by an individual or a department, and is open to all autocratic and bureaucratic abuses. The evils of control differ only in degree from those of complete suppression. It stifles the most valuable of opinions—that of the moderate masses—whose voice will not then be heard until the damage done by an unwise policy is all but irreparable. This has been Germany's experience. German liberals are being supported now that the result of junkerism is plain; but to have been most effective this public opinion should have asserted itself before, as it surely would have but for "control." It is true that the people may express what they are thinking by failing to support loans, and by rioting; but if they must have recourse to such methods, wherein are they better situated than the people of Germany? Interference with free speech really amounts to suspending democratic government, and invites all the evils of such a course.

ALBERT LUNDBERG

Fairdale, North Dakota, December 20

Fatalism and Determinism in Literature

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Woodbridge's letter about the "pessimistic fatalism" of Mark Twain suggests to me that the distinction which philosophers are wont to make between fatalism and determinism may have considerable significance for literature. Determinism finds in the causal nexus a complete explanation of events and things, and denies that this nexus can ever be broken; the doctrine that a man's life is completely conditioned by environmental pressure is thus deterministic. Fatalism, on the other hand, denies just this causal nexus, and would substitute for copious explanations of causes a laconic "Kismet." For determinism the row of bricks toppling over in succession figures forth the connected movement of the world; for fatalism the fall of each brick is a discrete event, related not to other events, but to the operation of some agency for which there can be no formula.

These two doctrines, when isolated, produce antipodal kinds of literature. At one extreme, the literary result of a dominating interest in determinism is, in modern writing, a "realistic" novel. At the other extreme, the literary result of a dominating interest in fatalism is something like the aphoristic literature of the Orient. On the one hand, the belief that circumstances contain the explanation of life furnishes the strongest possible incentive to an exact and continuous rendering of the environment; on the other hand, the consciousness of the *de facto* unity which Fate imposes is so strong that an individual image or dictum does not need the support of adjacent circumstances, but has a footing of its own, so to speak, in the Eternal.

Though the two doctrines can be thus sharply distinguished, it must be admitted that they are combined or confused in some moods. The quotations from Mark Twain which Mr. Woodbridge gives show such a confusion. Or I pick up the Arabian Nights at random and read:

> Our footsteps follow on in their predestined way,
> Nor from the ordered track can any mortal stray;
> And he whom Fate appoints in any land to die,
> No other place on earth shall see his dying day.

Thomas Hardy handles environmental pressure in a deterministic way, but the great disasters which he deduces from trivial circumstances reveal such disparity between cause and effect as to give the impression of fatalism. The Greek τύχη represents a combination of the two doctrines, with fatalism dominating, and to the choruses of Greek tragedy we may turn for our best illustration of the poetic values to be got from the doctrine of an inscrutable cosmos. Spinoza's *amor intellectualis Dei* illustrates the noble possibilities of the purely deterministic position; the same spirit is expressed in the concluding lines of Meredith's "Lucifer in Starlight":

> Soaring through wider zones that prick'd his scars
> With memory of the old revolt from Awe,
> He reache'd a middle height, and at the stars,
> Which are the brain of heaven, he looked, and sank.
> Around the ancient track march'd, rank on rank,
> The army of unalterable law.

ALAN D. MCKILLOP

Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., November 25

Curiosity or Phlegm

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: To those of us who have read of the Zeppelin and aeroplane raids in England; of the people rushing to the housetops and crowding into the open streets—eager for a sight of the death-dealing craft—it may not be amiss to quote from a letter of Horace Walpole written in 1745, during a threatened invasion of Britain by the French. How steadfast we find the characteristics of the race! The utter disregard of danger (though not always a virtue) is as distinctive an attribute of an Englishman to-day (be he "Tommy" or civilian) as it was of his ancestors, a hundred and seventy years ago.

> It is quite the fashion to talk of the French coming here. Nobody sees it in any other light, but as a thing to be talked of—not to be precautioned against. Don't you remember a report of the plague being in the city, and everybody went to the house where it was to see it? You see I laugh about it, for I would not for the world be so un-Englished as to do otherwise. I am persuaded that when Count Saxe with ten thousand men is within a day's march of London people will be hiring windows at Charing Cross and Cheap Side to see them pass by. *'Tis our characteristic to take dangers for sights and evils for curiosities.*

RUTH S. BROOKS

Gloucester, Mass., December 30

Colonial Book Peddlers

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In connection with an attempt to ascertain the extent of colonial libraries and the facilities for the purchase of books in New England during the first century of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

colonization, I have endeavored with but slight success to find definite information in regard to the identity or stock in trade of book peddlers or hawkers. The earliest reference which I have found is in the Diary of Cotton Mather, in the year 1683 (Vol. I, 65):

> There is an old *Hawker*, who will fill this Countrey with devout and useful Books, if I will direct him.

Thirty years later he again mentioned the hawkers (II, 242):

> I am informed, that the Minds and Manners of many People about the Countrey are much corrupted, by foolish Songs and Ballads, which the Hawkers and Pedlars carry into all parts of the Countrey.

This evil grew so serious that later in the year the Provincial Assembly passed a law restricting the peddlers (Province Laws, I, 720, published November 14, 1713). The law troubled Mather, for he wrote in his Diary (II, 283):

> I must also assist the Booksellers, in addressing the Assembly, that their late Act against Pedlers, may not hinder their Hawkers from carrying Books of Piety about the Countrey.

Of all the hawkers who peddled books over the hilly roads of New England, I have been able to identify but one, James Gray. The following item appeared in the Boston *News-Letter* of April 9-16, 1705:

> On Thursday last Dyed at Boston, James Gray, That used to go up and down the Country Selling of Books, who left some considerable Estate behind him; and 'tis confidently affirmed that he made a Will, which he left in some honest persons hand, with some other Papers, which have not yet been found: And any person in Town or Country who have said Will or Papers, are desired to bring them unto the Office of Probates in Boston.

Judge Sewall was sufficiently interested in either the man or the case to make a note of the amount of the estate on the margin of his copy of the *News-Letter*. Edward Bromfield and Paul Dudley were appointed administrators of the estate. According to their final accounting (Suffolk Probate Records, XVI, 620-621), the value of the estate was £712.11.3. Almost all of this was in coin, eight bags of currency of all kinds and denominations being listed in the inventory. This was no mean estate for New England at that time. If all the book-hawkers were as prosperous as "James Gray, Bookseller *als.* Pedler" (I quote from the Probate Record), the country folk of New England had a greater interest in literature, of a sort at least, than has generally been accredited to them.

Can any other hawkers be identified? Is there any extant evidence as to the nature of the books they carried, or of the extent of their business? I should greatly appreciate any information in regard to them, or references to them, especially for the period previous to 1730.

THOMAS G. WRIGHT

New Haven, Conn., December 9

"Le Jongleur de Notre Dame"

MONSIEUR LE DIRECTEUR DE LA NATION:

C'est avec une grande surprise que je vois, dans un récent numéro de *The International*, une revue de New York, une nouvelle de M. Anatole France, "Our Lady's Juggler," donnée comme "écrite spécialement pour les lecteurs de ce journal." *The International* me parait ainsi se moquer le plus audacieusement du monde de ses lecteurs. "Our Lady's Juggler"—en français, "Le Jongleur de Notre Dame"—est une nouvelle que M. Anatole France a publié il y a près de vingt ans, et que vous trouverez reproduite dans ses Œuvres Complètes, éditées chez M. Calmann-Lévy, 3 rue Auber, Paris.

De plus, on en a tiré un opéra comique qui a été joué plusieurs centaines de fois, en France et à l'étranger, depuis dix ans!

Il est donc impossible que la traduction, "Our Lady's Juggler," soit donnée comme un cadeau original que M. Anatole France aurait fait aux lecteurs de *The International* et á son directeur.

Veuillez agréer, cher monsieur, l'assurance de ma consideration très distinguée. PIERRE MILLE

15 quai Bourbon, Paris, 20 Novembre

BOOKS

A Wolverine Chief

Burrows of Michigan and the Republican Party. By William Dana Orcutt. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 2 vols. $6 net.

MR. ORCUTT has made a wise choice of a title for his book, for the life of Julius Cæsar Burrows, considered by itself and apart from his political affiliations and activities, contained too little that was distinctive to furnish material for a biography of the ordinary sort. He was in his party, and of it, by right of birth, very much in the same way that the children of adherents of certain religious organizations are born into the church. His father was a Connecticut Free Soiler, who migrated to the West to grow up with the country, and who accepted, next to the Christian Scriptures, the New York *Tribune* as his guide of faith and conduct. In the household Julius heard the slavery question and related public issues so frequently discussed by the elder members, among themselves and with visitors, that his mind received even as a boy a strong bent towards the abolition cause; and when, in his eighteenth year, he learned of the launching of the Republican party, he was enthusiastic to join it. Not long afterward we find him in a congenial atmosphere, as principal of a rural school in Ashtabula County, Ohio, playing ball in his leisure hours with Joshua Giddings and summoning the children of "Ben" Wade to recite their lessons to him.

From early childhood Julius manifested an ardent love of oratory. He once heard Daniel Webster deliver an address at an open-air mass meeting near his home, and on another occasion listened at his father's table to Fred Douglass's eloquent discussion of the events of the day. One of his favorite Sunday pastimes at the age of five was to rig up a pulpit of chairs and boxes and preach to his playmates, composing his sermons of Bible verses he had memorized for the purpose. Before he was ten he was once discovered perched on a stump behind the barn, delivering an oration. The derisive jeers of his brothers hurt his pride, but failed to shake his confidence. "I don't care," he hurled back between his sobs of mortification; "some day you will hear my voice in the halls of Congress!" As he grew up, his enthusiasm for instructing others bore more substantial fruit, and he appears to have contributed an energetic share on the hustings to the Lincoln campaign of 1860. Mean-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

while, he had become a resident of Michigan, and with the outbreak of the Civil War he dedicated himself to the task of stirring up a loyal popular sentiment in that State. His speeches attracted the attention of the Governor, who gave him a captain's commission in a volunteer infantry regiment. The attitude of the Burrows of that day towards the President he had helped to elect had a quality not unfamiliar to any one who has watched the development of public feeling in regard to the share of the United States in the world war now in progress. Although he later came to take a more temperate view of his great chief, yet Lincoln's long-suffering patience was so incomprehensible to his fiery soul that he could not forbear writing to a Kalamazoo newspaper:

> When we shall get through making big men, when we shall cease our grand reviews and begin our grand march, when our Government has the manliness and courage to look traitors in the face and say, "So far and no farther," when it gets through patting treason and licking the feet of traitors, when the Government dares speak in our Congress, in our Executive, in his Cabinet, not by wordy proclamations, but by law and bullets, then and not till then shall we be victorious!

His regiment made an admirable record, but Captain Burrows was reduced by hard work and illness to scarcely more than a shadow of his former self, and was invalided to a hospital near Washington, whence he wandered forth, as his strength would permit, to look over the city which was one day to be his home. He was able to take a vigorous part in the campaign for Lincoln for reëlection. Soon after that he was in demand to fill various local and Federal offices in Michigan; the latter he did not care to accept, but in 1872 he was elected to represent his district in the Forty-third Congress. It was not a very brilliant début. Almost the first important question to come up was that of enlarging and perpetuating our greenback currency by means of a measure which, had it been successful, might have shattered all hope of bringing the national finances back to a safe and sane basis after the demoralization caused by the recent war; and Burrows, harping rhetorically on the sacredness of the "blood-stained greenback," ranged himself on the side of the inflationists. The people of his district would have none of that sort of thing; as a punishment, his effort for reëlection failed dismally, and he stayed at home for two Congresses thereafter. In the Forty-seventh Congress he reëmerged, only to drop out of the Forty-eighth. The Forty-ninth welcomed him back to his old place, and from 1885 to 1911 he remained a national lawmaker, passing from House to Senate in 1895. Just what led to his final retirement may be open to question; but probably his identification with the spirit of a bygone era in the political life of the republic, in defiance of the radical bent of everything in the later generation, gave the opposition to him its most positive impulse.

Burrows kept no diaries, and apparently few copies of letters written by him to others. He was assiduous, however, in his collection of newspaper clippings about himself, letters written to him, and extracts from the public record of incidents in which he figured; these he preserved in scrapbooks, and they furnish the bulk of the material out of which the biographer has constructed his work. As may be imagined, such things do not lend themselves readily to the human coloring of a picture. In the more than seven hundred pages which constitute the two volumes before us, the only attempts to set forth a portrait of the man, as distinguished from the politician and the legislator, are found in the little sketch of the life of the Burrows family in the early years of its most widely known member, and a chapter at the junction of the accounts of his services as Representative and Senator, in which are collected a number of characteristic anecdotes, designed to show the trend of his mind along certain lines and the play of his wit and humor.

As the intimate of William McKinley in the House, second member on the Committee of Ways and Means which set afloat the fateful Tariff bill of 1890, as the friend to whose loyalty Alger owed his appointment as Secretary of War, the parliamentarian who, by an unprecedentedly bold move, struck the Free-Silver Coinage bill of 1892 its death-blow, as the chief Republican Senator who dared face down Boss Quay at the most serious crisis in the latter's public career, and as the successor of Edmunds in leading the Federal war upon Utah's offences in the domain of polygamy, Burrows stands among the noticeable figures in the Washington of the last thirty years. Hence, to the student of American history during this vital and highly dramatic period, Mr. Orcutt's work will be of distinct value; for his endeavor to explain the conditions leading up to every important act of his hero involves either a clear statement of facts with a very broad bearing on the national life, or a suggestive grouping of those of minor consequence which will indicate to the student the direction in which it might be profitable to continue a search. There is an excellent index appended to the text, but both text and index are marred somewhat by carelessness in the spelling of sundry proper names, and by trifling errors of fact, like the statement that President Harrison "appointed Theodore Roosevelt chairman of the Civil Service Commission"—a post to which Presidents do not appoint Commissioners, and one which Roosevelt, in spite of a common misapprehension on that score, never held at any time.

An Empire in Embryo

The Beginning of English Overseas Enterprise. By Sir Charles P. Lucas. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 6s. 6d.

SIR CHARLES LUCAS, old-time official of the British Colonial Office, historian of the British colonies in general and of Canada in particular, and friend of many Americans, has in his retirement from active administrative duties turned his attention to the past of the British Empire. His desire is to determine some of the factors that have been influential in its development and to show that the Empire itself is no fortuitous or forced union of kingdoms, dominions, and dependencies, but a natural growth representative of the genius of the British people. In order to demonstrate these points, he takes up the history of the oldest commercial companies, whose careers mark the beginnings of oversea enterprise. That which constitutes the main part of his study is the history of the Merchant Adventurers, for the chapter on the Eastland Company adds but little to the evidence on which the conclusions are based.

Regarding the historical portions of this work, we may speak very briefly. What Sir Charles has written is probably the most complete and best-balanced account that we have of the Merchant Adventurers and their relations to the Merchants of the Staple and the Hanseatic League. It rests in part upon the writer's own investigations and in part upon the work of others, among whom Dr. Lingelbach, of the University of Pennsylvania, receives a deserved recognition.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The account of the Eastland Company is drawn almost entirely from Miss Sellers's well-known treatise. Much is brought out that is new and suggestive in the character and organization of the Merchant Adventurers. Stress is laid on the fact that in personnel and purpose they were, in contrast with the Staplers, "rigidly and exclusively Englishmen, domiciled or sojourning across the seas, in foreign parts though near at home, and concerned with importing into the cities and lands wherein they planted themselves not wool grown in England, but cloth made in England from English wool." Though in early years they consisted of several groups, Adventurers of such towns as Bristol, Exeter, and Newcastle as well as the larger Merchant Adventurers of England, a body dominated by Londoners, they became, by the Elizabethan charter of 1564, essentially one national company, composed of all merchants in the North Sea trade, an all-English fellowship, in which even London was merged, and in which interests, ceasing to be metropolitan or provincial, gradually became unitary and national. Thus the growth of this patriotic fellowship is representative of the growth of the Empire itself.

But the author finds more than this in the history of the company; he deems the Merchant Adventurers the "pioneers of the great destiny of a great people," since their long career of four hundred years (1407-1808) had more influence in determining the future of England than any battle in which Englishmen ever fought. Growing out of a municipal guild, the Mercers' Guild of London, and shaped along the lines of such a guild for the larger purpose of trading beyond the seas, this purely private concern received powers and privileges at the hand of the Crown that gave form very early to the characteristic English method of utilizing private organizations as machinery for state purposes. This coöperation between state authority and private enterprise, says Sir Charles, "has been the greatest of all factors in the making of the Empire. No other people than the English have developed so strongly, so illogically, and so successfully an understanding between private initiative and state control. . . . This embodiment of private initiative under the sanction of the state forms a working compromise such as the English love," whereby English citizens combine "with one another to serve at once their own interests and those of the nation at times and places and in ways of their own choosing." The importance of a study of these companies lies in the fact that "they were the special means, which the English above all nations devised and perfected on their own peculiar lines for making an Empire . . . the incarnation of private enterprise under state license and modified state control," a system which with all its defects "has had the great merit of elasticity" because "better adapted to a process of evolution, of continuous growth, than any other product of the direct action of the state."

Another fertile suggestion concerns the origin of the idea of self-government for Englishmen beyond the seas, whether as traders or colonists. This idea is not as self-evident as has sometimes been assumed. Sir Charles would find its first expression in the charter of 1407, which was not a charter to give a trade monopoly, but a charter to grant a constitution, enabling Englishmen sojourning in foreign parts to govern themselves. The origin of the idea lay in the need of better government, "and the way in which better government is to be obtained is by granting self-government." A noteworthy application of this principle came two hundred years later when the great charter for Virginia was sent over in 1618. Thus a privilege conferred upon a group of English merchants in the Low Countries was extended to a body of colonists on the banks of the James, and there came into existence, for the first time in history, that most significant of institutions—the self-governing colony—which was to affect profoundly the development of the Empire. Thus we are to trace our form of government, not to a parliamentary model, as used to be thought, but to the local institutions of old England, the guild, the municipality, and the trading company, with a grafting on to the main stock of features of parliamentary representation and privilege.

The final conclusion that the author would have us draw as to the importance of the Merchant Adventurers in the working out of England's destiny can be stated largely in his own words. The British Empire was won "by trade and settlement and not by conquest; it was the work of English citizens and not of English kings, not the result of definitive state policy, not of strong action by determined rulers and resolute governments, but a slow process of compromise between war and peace, between private initiative and state control, such a compromise as commended itself day by day to the practical instincts of a liberty-loving island race." Great Britain has grown from an island into an empire, the only island empire that the world has thus far seen, and the pioneers and builders of empire have not been the "conquering kings of the Middle Ages," but the enterprising private traders and colonists who laid deep the foundations upon which the state has built. The strength of these foundations is the strength to-day of the Empire itself.

Guessing Around Giotto

Giotto and Some of His Followers. By Osvald Sirén. English translation by Frederic Schenck. 2 vols., quarto. Harvard University Press. $12 net.

THESE two stately tomes, with their fine letterpress, hand-made paper, cartridge boards, and collotype prints, give a first impression of importance which fades rapidly on closer inspection. Dr. Sirén has merely refurbished the excellent talks he has been giving on Giotto, with extracts from former books on Giotto, Giottino, and other followers, and more particularly with the latest hypotheses which have dawned upon the most volatile of critics.

Since Dr. Sirén's Swedish book on Giotto, one of the most satisfactory, he has made great changes. Following the skepticism of Venturi, whom he barely mentions, he now doubts if any of the stories of St. Francis, in the Basilica at Assisi, are by Giotto, or for that matter the famous and lovely Franciscan Allegories in the cross-vaults of the Lower Church. Giotto is seen only at Padua, in Sta. Croce, and in two panels, including the lately recovered Dormition of the Virgin, now at Berlin. In the closeness of the canon Dr. Sirén has fairly outdone Venturi.

The issues involved cannot be adequately treated in the space allotted to the reviewer. Enough to say that to treat the Paduan frescoes as Giotto's beginnings is to assume a unique miracle in the history of art. Moreover, the rude and uneven but generally forceful stories of St. Francis, at Assisi, reveal a parallel and, naturally, confused striving towards the ideals which Giotto subsequently reached—namely, mass, conciseness, and narrative and decorative breadth. In short, the stories of St. Francis are so precisely what young Giotto should be that if we reject them,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we should be driven to assume entirely similar works which had been lost.

The whole criticism of Giotto has been cramped by the tendency to make Padua the sole touchstone. As a matter of fact, the sculptural conciseness of the arena frescoes is merely a phase. Having achieved a certain technical perfection, Giotto never cared to repeat it, but passed on to work in which mass is secondary to decorative breadth. No discerning admirer of the frescoes at Sta. Croce should have any trouble in admitting the Franciscan Allegories at Assisi as at least designed by Giotto. The trouble is that Sta. Croce is generally ignored or taken for granted because the work is repainted. Furthermore, all critics have too much neglected the literary evidence for Giotto's latest panoramic designs. It has been the foible of modern connoisseurship to treat as negligible everything but the visible monument—to treat as a simple problem in connoisseurship what is actually a very delicate appraisal in historical evidence. If we actually had Giotto's great wall paintings of Good and Bad Government and of the Christian Faith—compositions the temper of which we may surmise from the Last Judgment at Padua—Giotto would appear as the predecessor and master of the panoramists of the mid-century. Indeed, much that modern criticism attributes to the influence of Ambrogio Lorenzetti may with better reason be derived from Giotto's latest manner. Ambrogio himself was probably rather an intelligent adapter of Giotto's decorative mode than an originator of anything.

In such a view of Giotto's development the design of the Franciscan Allegories would find its place somewhere near the Sta. Croce frescoes. This was Dr. Sirén's view in his Swedish work on Giotto, a work which still took common sense and historic probability into account.

The discussion of Giotto's followers brings to light a number of unpublished pictures and puts forth startling points of view. A few years ago, in his book on Giottino, Dr. Sirén saw that master everywhere, and identified him with the painter of the late *Trecento*, who is known to have worked in the Vatican. Now Giottino, following Vasari's notices, is identified with Maso, who was a direct pupil of Giotto. The canon has been correspondingly abridged to a mere half-dozen works. What Maso-Giottino has lost, the Cione family has won. Where Dr. Sirén used to see Giottino, he now sees either Andrea Orcagna or members of his clan. We cannot follow the dizzy process of reattribution. We may only note that Dr. Sirén blithely rises on stepping-stones of critical dead selves which he usually forbears so much as to mention.

Where Berenson cautiously admits for Orcagna only the signed altar piece in the Strozzi Chapel, Dr. Sirén heaps together under that great name about a score of miscellaneous works, wherein at least three hands and two schools are discernible. The remarkable frescoes in the choir of the Badia, which Bacci, following Vasari, ascribed to Buffalmacco, are transferred to Nardo di Cione. The palpably inferior artist who frescoed the vaults of Sta. Chiaia at Assisi is made responsible both for the Franciscan Allegories, the delightful Childhood of Christ, in the Lower Church, and for the stories of St. Francis at Pistoia. He is no other than Puccio Capanna. But to common-sense such a reconstruction rolls together at least three different masters of very different capacity. Occasionally Dr. Sirén seems conscious of the shakiness of his procedures, representing them as steps towards truth. The fact is that such speculations are properly ventilated in the journals. Books, important looking books at that, are not the proper media for temporary hypotheses, however brilliant. Many books like the present one would reduce the still moderately serious subject of history of art to a subjectivism not far removed from charlatanism.

The permanently valuable part of this book is the second volume of collotype plates, some two hundred, but even here the make-up is incredibly unhandy. The reader to discover the authorship or rather attribution of any plate must turn to the volume of text. Even the index of plates has no names of artists. The reader must write in his own captions.

The Leghs of Lyme

The House of Lyme from its Foundation to the End of the Eighteenth Century. By the Lady Newton. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $6.50 net.

FOR the motto of this excellent book Lady Newton, wife of the present head of the family, might have chosen the words of one of the guardians of the estate to its young owner in 1651: "A man's estate is much his honor, for take that away, and what's a gent more than one man?" The book is, in fact, a history of the House of Lyme in the double sense that it tells much of the actual building of stone and brick and mortar (with many excellent illustrations by the way), and of the family of Leghs (the name is merely another spelling of Leigh) who have lived in it from the time of its erection in the early seventeenth century, and who owned the land long before. " 'Dear Lyme,' 'sweet Lyme'—they call it by no other epithet," says the author of the place and the people; "their longing to get back to it when absent, their joy at their return to what for them is the only spot on earth, is apparent through hundreds of years." And so intimate and interesting is the record of this home that at the end the reader feels almost as if he had a right to join in the historian's concluding prayer, that the "tiny Peter, born into a very saddened world," and bearing "the red hair which made its first appearance at Lyme some five hundred years ago," may "prove himself a not unworthy son of that greater England that shall emerge triumphant from the present struggle." For if the estate is much the honor of a family, so are such families much the honor of a land.

This is not to say that the Leghs appear in the record as saints, or have been distinguished by great and shining deeds. The family is rather typical than exceptional. Perhaps the most notable character of all is "the last Sir Peter," who built the house and ruled his children with a stern hand, but otherwise accomplished nothing notable. The most entertaining chapters of the book are those which record the doings of this family tyrant in the early seventeenth century, and continue the fortunes of his sons and grandsons down to the Richard whose love for his wife and whose decent manner of living shines out quite beautifully in the annals of the Restoration. The prettiest letter in the volume is that of this Richard to his beloved Elizabeth:

> Deare Soule, every instant is two without thee. There is no diversion heere pleasant without thee, thou mayest believe me for I take no satisfaction in them. I was never wearier of this place, especially wanting thee, and ten thousand thousand times wish thee in mine arms. Noe wife breathing has a more true constant loving husband than he that subscribes himselfe
>
> Solely thine.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That, in literature at least, was not the common tone of a husband to his wife from the court of Charles II.

The father of this Richard was Dr. Thomas Legh, a younger son of the last Sir Peter, a divine of some note in his day. This Thomas was educated at Oxford and held the living at Walton; he was a student and collector of books, and a great writer of letters. "His correspondents, one of whom was Richard Parr, Bishop of Sodor and Man," Lady Newton says, "were chiefly old Oxford friends to whom he wrote at great length, receiving immensely long letters in return. These abound in Latin quotations, and are full of heavy, obscure, and somewhat broad jokes, chiefly relating to Brasenose and its officials, some of whom appear to have been extremely unpopular." From the few extracts given one gets the impression that this correspondence, if printed *in extenso*, would be unique in its way, a most valuable and not unamusing record of university life of the day. We wish it could be published, but, as there is mercy among editors, we wish also that it might be transformed in spelling so as to be readable.

We have nothing to criticise in Lady Newton's work, except that her historic perspective is sometimes a little askew. "Life for the women," she observes of the period of the last Sir Peter, "must indeed have been of a dreary monotony." That "the dirt must have been indescribable," we may admit; that "the habits of both the gentlemen and ladies and of the time seem to our modern ideas absolutely uncivilized," we may also admit. But, after all, life may be very happy amidst certain kinds of dirt, and modern ideas may not measure the whole of civilization. And as for the dreariness of life the phrase seems utterly out of place when one considers the large responsibilities and the high views of the great ladies as they appear to us in the annals of that age. Let us not call the want of automobiles physical inertia, nor regard the absence of newspapers and magazines as intellectual stagnation. Indeed, it is one of the excellences of Lady Newton's own book that it brings home to our hearts this truth which the modern world is so slow to realize.

Notes

AMONG the forthcoming publications of the Century Company is "The Life and Confessions of the Mad Monk, Iliodor—Sergius M. Trufanoff."

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY announces for publication in January the following volumes—Miscellaneous: "Wounded and a Prisoner of War," by An Exchanged Officer; "Manual for the Use of Troops in Aid of the Civil Authority," by Brig.-Gen. Louis L. Babcock; "The World's Debate," by Monsignor William Barry; "Alone in the Caribbean," by Frederic A. Fenger; "Naval Power in the War," by Lieut.-Commander Charles C. Gill; "Belgium in War Time," by Commandant de Gerlache de Gomery; "The Bloodless War," by Ezio M. Gray; "A Boswell of Baghdad," by E. V. Lucas; "Lord Northcliffe's War Book," by Lord Northcliffe; "The Escape of a Princess Pat," by George Eustace Pearson; "Arthur James Balfour: Philosopher and Thinker," by Wilfred M. Short; "In Mesopotamia," by Martin Swayne; "World Peace, a Written Debate," between William Howard Taft and William Jennings Bryan; "The German Terror in France," by Arnold J. Toynbee; "From Diaz to the Kaiser," by Mrs. Alec Tweedie; "The Crime and Its Moral," by J. S. Willmore.—Fiction: "The Long Trick," by "Bartimeus"; "W. E. Ford, a Biography," by J. D. Beresford and Kenneth Richmond; "Under Sealed Orders," by H. A. Cody; "The Keys of Heaven," by Clara B. Laughlin; "Love and Hatred," by Mrs. Belloc Lowndes; "The Brown Brethren," by Patrick MacGill; "Ninety-six Hours Leave," by Stephen McKenna; "The Red Cross Barge," by Mrs. Baillie Reynolds; "The Invisible Passport," by Perley Poore Sheehan; and "In the Night," by Frank Swinnerton.

ALTHOUGH in his latest book, "The Choice before Us" (Dodd, Mead; $2 net), Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson styles himself a pacifist, he admits that after the invasion of Belgium England had no choice but to enter the war; and he applauds the motive which brought the United States into the conflict. He is a pacifist to the extent of believing that in the future international disagreements should be settled by peaceful means. He advocates disarmament, save for an international force designed to make effective the decisions of a league of nations, or in the case of a country bordering upon savage tribes. Mr. Dickinson is a practical pacifist: he makes allowance for the march of civilization, roughshod, over territory of backward peoples, insisting upon the need of developing the earth's resources to the full. He is always cautious in the measures which he suggests, and, though he runs through the whole range of causes contributing to war, demonstrating how they may be peacefully dealt with, there is none of the tone of a Q. E. D. in his conclusion.

ON the whole, Mr. Dickinson presents a strong case against the militarists. He has taken account of their writings in several countries and shows the falsity of their logic. A valuable service performed by the author is his collection of scattered statements made by prominent representatives of the Allied nations into a formidable body of militaristic doctrine. It is a dangerous plant in whatever soil it may be rooted. If this war is fought in the interests of those who look forward to a world heavily armed, we shall achieve few of the high hopes which have ranged democracy against tyranny. If Prussianism can be decisively overcome, so the practical pacifist reasons, the victors should enforce their triumph by removing the causes of such a world conflagration. Of these the most aggravating is armament. We shall not attempt to detail the steps by which Mr. Dickinson examines the economic irritants in international relations. Here he is following the path blazed by Norman Angell. Nor is it necessary to outline his specific suggestions for a league of nations, to which his argument finally leads. He admits the existence of several obstacles, and we might cite others. Yet when all is said, his book, with its copious notes, queries, and suggestions, is one which statesmen having in their keeping the peace of the world would be well advised to study carefully.

PROFESSOR HAZEN'S new book, "Alsace-Lorraine under German Rule" (Holt; $1.25 net), offers the most complete and, basically, the most trustworthy treatment of the theme that has yet appeared in English. Unquestionably, as Professor Hazen shows with finality, the Alsatians are much more akin to the French than to the Germans in all that makes life worth while, and Germany has failed utterly to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assimilate that unhappy land. It is, however, not difficult to find many flaws in the new book. Historical, in the highest sense, the book is not, as it shows little of the fine balance and breadth of view which the reader expects from the author of "Europe Since 1815." Rather does it bear frequent evidence of the heat which forged it, of haste, and even of confusion. For example, is it true that "this question [of Alsace-Lorraine and its French or German allegiance] has dominated the policy of every nation of Europe" ever since the Treaty of Frankfort? If "nothing about the Holy Roman Empire was static and little about it was impressive" (p. 25), it is surprising that the effects of the feudal ideas and institutions which "worked unchecked" in the Empire "have proved perdurable" (p. 27). Professor Hazen's chief conclusions are also highly questionable. Many readers will not agree that Alsace-Lorraine ought to be handed over to France without a plébiscite; others will not believe that to make Alsace-Lorraine an independent and autonomous monarchy or an independent and neutralized state "are but ways of evading the problem." On the contrary, it will not be forgotten that, before the heat of the war entered into us, Englishmen of repute advanced convincing arguments for the permanent incorporation of Alsace in the German Empire (*cf.* Johnston in the *Nineteenth Century Review*, January, 1914). In reviewing the work of a Hazen it is not captious to refer also to the author's treatment of a foreign language. Professor Hazen invariably misspells the title of the provincial legislature, the Landesausschuss, betraying his failure to grasp the word by printing it "Landesauschuss." In another instance, he gives a thoroughly unfair twist to a German peroration by translating "Das walte Gott!" by "God wills it!" A casual German reader might reasonably doubt Professor Hazen's knowledge of German.

"THE Fishermen," by Dmitry Grigorovich (McBride; $1.50), introduces an author whose career extended from the infantile stage of Russian literature to its fullest development. Grigorovich (1822-1899) was responsible for the publication of Dostoievsky's first story, "Poor Folk"; at the end of his life he was one of the first to appreciate the art of Chekhov. He struck the keynote for the peasant *genre*, and in fact preceded and probably influenced the appearance of Turgenev's "Sketches of a Sportsman." Like most of his contemporaries, Grigorovich emulated the peasant stories of George Sand; the flavor of "La Mare au Diable" is felt throughout his novels, lending an exaggerated sweetness to his Central Russian *paysans*. In "The Fishermen," as in his other novels, the author showed a deep knowledge of the simple people living along the River Oka, and a pathetic love for the sad, monotonous landscape of the Central Plain (he was for many years connected with the Russian school of painting, and somewhat of a painter himself). In his love for the common people, Grigorovich appeared, more even than Turgenev, the "repentant nobleman," the liberal landowner who endeavored to come down to the downtrodden and to atone for the sins of the privileged. Hence the idealization of the characters. Furthermore, Grigorovich lacked deep psychological insight; he was more of a careful landscapist and an ethnographic observer than a vivisector of the human soul. Only in exceptional cases did he succeed in depicting a boldly outstanding character, as, for instance, in the old fisherman Glyeb, the sturdy champion of patriarchal Russia, who gravely denounces the oncoming evil of factories and city life. Here again we see the point of view of a landed aristocrat. It may be pertinent to recall the words of Tolstoy, then in his 'teens, who, after reading Grigorovich's novels, "discovered with joy and enthusiasm that the Russian muzhik, our bread-giver and teacher, could and should be described without sneering, and not for the purpose of enlivening the landscape, but could and should be presented full-size, and not only with love but also with respect and even with reverence."

THESE leaves from a Manchurian notebook, "Pioneering Where the World Is Old" (Holt; $1.50), will cause many a reader to long to follow where Alice Tisdale pipes the way. True gypsy, her journeyings are high romance, though marvellously true in detail. The wife of a business man in China, she shares her comrade husband's pioneering in Manchuria, lurching over rough country in a springless two-wheeled cart, through the interminable, green *kaoliang*, over the deep snows of the lonely winter, across mountain passes beyond the Great Wall, in a junk up the swollen Yalu, marooned in floods of the summer rains. Adventure rides at her heels, sometimes gaining on her all too fast, as in the case of the Red-Beard bandits. Those of us whose legs have dangled from the shafts of a Peking cart, who have tried to transmute despair into Oriental calm on the *k'ang* of a Manchurian inn, marvel at this poet who has no downward glance for filth, squalor, and ugliness. Evil is admitted by Alice Tisdale—in the case of the Japanese! But it is to be expected that a self-confessed pagan in love with the old disorder would resent the new orderliness of Japan. To her eyes Japan has spoiled the picturesqueness of Korea—health, cleanliness, schools, and post offices perhaps not being requisites to a follower of Pan. She is naturally jealous for the interests of the people she has chosen to dwell among, in the debatable land of Manchuria. Her province, however, is of the spirit, and her quest is as joyous as a child's. The book was started "for the purpose of giving the breath of the open spaces to the stay-at-home vagabonds." This it does in a remarkable degree.

IN "Vagabonding Down the Andes" (Century; $4 net), Harry A. Franck has given us the narrative of a journey, chiefly afoot, from Panama to Buenos Aires. It is by far the most spontaneous and interesting of his peripatetic accounts, and this is probably due to his recent military

The Nation
FOUNDED 1865

Published Thursdays. Owned by THE NATION PRESS, INC.,
OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, President.
EMIL M. SCHOLZ, Publisher, Secy. and Treas.

Entered at the New York City Post Office as second class mail matter.

HAROLD DE WOLF FULLER, EDITOR
R. B. McCLEAN, BUSINESS MANAGER
WILLIAM G. PRESTON, ADVERTISING MANAGER
ROBERT R. CLELAND, CIRCULATION MANAGER

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—Four dollars per annum, postpaid, in United States and Mexico; to Canada, $4.50, and to foreign countries comprised in the Postal Union, $5.00.
Address, THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street.
P. O. Box 794, New York.

LONDON OFFICE: 16 Regent St., S. W.; WASHINGTON OFFICE: Home Life Building; CHICAGO OFFICE: People's Gas Building.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duties which "made it impossible to give it final polish, to eliminate much that should have been eliminated and to improve much of what remains." Franck's books justify the day-to-day diary form; he is a master of detail, of local vignettes, of discriminate minutiæ. There is sufficient incident, danger, and adventure to hold the unimaginative reader, and yet one who demands larger horizons may sense, from this mosaic of a walker's impressions, a very real and adequate conception of the country and people at large. History and geography are relegated to an assumed knowledge on the part of the reader; people—peons, peasants, and serfs—form the dominant theme, with a satisfying background of scenery, sunsets, rivers, and mountains. The photographs taken by this literary vagabond are excellent and appropriate to the text. The omission of an index is quite inexcusable, and reduces the value of the book to that derived from a mere casual reading. Every geographical name and important fact should be so indexed that the very great deal of valuable information would be made available for reference, to travellers, and to the increasing number of those desiring to learn more of the latent, somnolent countries of our neighboring continent. These sins of omission are of increasing occurrence in books of travel—especially now that the peripatetics have gone further afield in their endeavor to enlist the stay-at-home reader's attention.

EVERY historian who has had occasion to work at all in the field of South African affairs knows the "History of South Africa from 1795 to 1872," by George McCall Theal. It is something of an event when such a standard work enters upon a fourth edition, "carefully revised and enlarged" (Macmillan; 5 vols.; $2.50 each). The author takes a quite pardonable pride in presenting the results of "the closest possible research among official documents of all kinds," and thus placing his work "confidently before the public as not alone the only detailed history of South Africa yet prepared, but as a true and absolutely unbiassed narrative." It is hardly necessary to characterize Theal's book; it is just what he says it is. It is the detailed history, almost the chronicle, rather than the philosophical account, of an extraordinary social development. It is the assembled, sifted material rather than the broad interpretation. But it represents the indispensable *Vorarbeit* in a new and as yet but partially appreciated field. It is comprehensive enough to include many ethnographical and other details which are of interest to others than historians. In short, it is unique in its line and will hardly be superseded. The revision and enlargement have to do chiefly with the greater detail, precision, and completeness of the narrative.

DAVISON'S "Mammalian Anatomy," with special reference to the Cat, is widely known and used, and this third edition (Blakiston; $2 net) would scarcely require mention here were it not for a few new features added by the reviser, Dr. S. A. Stromsten. The English equivalents of the Latin terms of the BNA nomenclature are introduced, and the section on classification has been enlarged and rewritten in the light of recent investigations. The section on Fiber Tracts has been omitted as appropriate to more advanced textbooks, while we find added the discussion of the Skull as a Whole. Premedical and general students will find this elementary anatomy quite free from the errors of earlier editions, and brought to date.

National Miniatures

Henry Lewis Stimson

"I AM now a soldier," was the sole response extorted from Henry Lewis Stimson by the interviewers who questioned him about his volunteering as an officer in the reserve corps of the Judge Advocate-General of the Army. He would probably have met in the same way any inquiries about his turning over his New York house to be used as a factory for clothing for the despoiled peasantry of northern France, so little does he enjoy talking about himself.

Stimson was a soldier when he first loomed into public view nearly a dozen years ago—a militiaman of New York's Squadron A. He was then practicing law in the firm founded by Elihu Root. Business called him to Washington, where, having an hour or two of leisure just before returning, he engaged a saddle-horse for a canter through Rock Creek Park. Suddenly he heard his name called by some unseen person on the opposite bank of the creek: "Stimson, come here!" While he was still looking around for the source of this summons, there came another, differently couched and in a different voice: "By order of the Secretary of War, Sergeant Stimson will report at once in person to the President of the United States." The tone and inflections he recognized as those of Secretary Root, and jumped at once to the conclusion that the previous call had come from President Roosevelt. Having nothing to guide him except the direction whence the voices had come, he wheeled his horse and plunged into the stream, which was swelled by recent rains. The first few yards were easily crossed; but then came a deeper channel flanked by an almost perpendicular wall of rock. The horse made a brave dash at it, but missed his footing and was swept back with such force that both steed and rider narrowly escaped submersion as they went floundering down with the current. Coming presently to a less precipitous shore-line, another effort brought them up on rough but solid ground. The faces of Root and Roosevelt showed their alarm as they hastened forward and received his formal salute. When they expressed their surprise that he should have responded literally to their little jest, "The first duty of a soldier is to obey," was Stimson's smiling answer; "what else would you have had me do?"

"The President," replied Roosevelt, "commands Sergeant Stimson to return immediately to his quarters, exchange his wet clothing for dry, and report at the White House messtent for dinner at eight o'clock sharp!"

Not long afterward a vacancy occurred in the office of the United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York. In the air hung a scent of trouble for sundry malefactors there, and the man to put them where they belonged must be one whose professional equipment was of the highest and his courage and uprightness beyond question. "I'll order Sergeant Stimson to cross that stream," said the President. "He'll do it, no matter what may be in the way." Sergeant Stimson was loath to drop a large and growing private practice for a public position which would net him only about half as much income, but the finger-post of duty pointed that way, so in he went. His recreation afternoon in Rock Creek Park resulted eventually in the enrichment of the Federal Treasury by more than four million dollars in penalties paid by Trusts, railway rebaters, and customs-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dodgers, by James Gordon Bennett for mailing the "Personal" column of the *Herald*, and the like, to say nothing of the imprisonment of Charles W. Morse and other offenders commonly believed to be too powerful to be locked up. When it was no longer practicable for him to remain in the Governmental harness, he consented to carry to completion the cases still unfinished, acting as special counsel.

A lover of outdoor sports, including the hunting of big game, it is not astonishing that he and Roosevelt should find each other thoroughly congenial, or that, though living so far from Washington, he should be a member of the famous "Tennis Cabinet." About two years after Roosevelt left the White House Stimson became a member of the real Cabinet under Taft. As Secretary of War, he put the finishing touches on many important things begun under Roosevelt, and also set the pace for later comers in the same place, as an apostle of official collaboration—a distinguishing feature of his administration being his habit of encouraging expressions of opinion from his subordinates. He called them into conference on every question towards the solution of which they could possibly contribute anything worth while, and his final decisions thus represented not his personal opinion alone, but, in a sense, the composite judgment of the Department. In these official matters he carried out a similar idea to that which actuated his methods as a lawyer, which have been described by a contemporary as "covering with a series of short tentative steps the ground which most of the profession try to clear with a single leap. It should be noted also," adds this commentator, "that when he reaches his goal, he's there to stay, whereas most of us have to go back and do some of our work over again."

Roosevelt, on his return from Africa, took a hand in New York politics. He made one of his sudden and strenuous descents upon the Republican State Convention of 1910, thrust the muzzle of his blunderbuss under the noses of the Stand-pat managers, and compelled them to nominate Stimson for Governor against their will, and then swung around the circle with a characteristic speech-making tour. But the good old days were gone when any command from the Colonel had to be swallowed whole by the rank and file, and on election day the Democrats swept the State. Of all the victims of the disaster, the most cheerful was Stimson himself. He had had the satisfaction of drawing the enemy's full fire, and discovering that the worst they could say about him was that he had been counsel for various corporations—a charge equally true of every man who has won a considerable place at the bar in our era of corporate enterprises—and that he was loyal in his friendship for his former partner, Elihu Root, that arch-foe of the Downtrodden Peepul! He showed the same manly spirit two years later, when, though Roosevelt had taken the field against Taft, he stood by Taft as a matter of principle, without denying his strong personal fondness for Roosevelt.

Stimson is a large man in everything except stature. His height is modest, his build sturdy but slight, his face a narrow oval, his coloring dark, and his general air young in spite of the gray that has crept into his hair and moustache. He has the mouth of one who talks little and the brow of one who thinks a good deal. His manner is as businesslike as his unobtrusive attire, and his eyeglasses accentuate the sharpness of his clearly chiselled profile. He does not "slop over," even when addressing an audience known to have a vivid taste in language; but when he starts after an object on his own initiative, whether it be a skulking sinner or a big bear, he never loses sight of the trail till he reaches the end of it. When the Kaiser is arraigned for murder, arson, pillage, and the corruption of the world's morals, may Stimson have a large hand in the prosecution! TATTLER

Reviews of Plays

TWO REVIVALS

COMEDY and tragedy of other days were revived on Broadway last week. Mr. Faversham's production of "Lord and Lady Algy" at the Broadhurst Theatre was followed by a rendering at the Empire Theatre of "The Lady of the Camellias," with Ethel Barrymore as Marguerite. The plays are alike to the extent that they both deal in a direct, elemental emotion complicated by highly artificial surroundings, and that this emotion as a driving power is kept distinct, in each instance, from beginning to end. If both are like faded flowers which can never be quite real again—the prologue and epilogue imposed on the French play by Edward Sheldon added no new life—an antiquarian interest in them is insured when they are well presented, as they are in these revivals.

The cast for "Lord and Lady Algy" includes, besides Mr. Faversham in the leading part, Maxine Elliott, who returns to the American stage after a number of years to make a striking figure as Lady Algy; Maclyn Arbuckle as the not unreasonably jealous Tudway; Irene Fenwick as the romantic and demure Mrs. Tudway, and Lumsden Hare as the Marquis of Quarmby. If the performance is only pleasing, not brilliant, Mr. Faversham has himself in no small measure to blame. There is a self-consciousness in his acting which shows in a decided lack of ease.

The production of Dumas fils's play brings out what every previous production of it has revealed—that Marguerite is drawn with the simplest lines and lives only through the distinctive personality of the actress enacting the part. Bernhardt and Duse were much themselves in their representations of Marguerite, and Marguerite at the Empire is very largely Miss Barrymore herself, in spite of a blond wig. Beauty and charm and, in moments, no little depth of feeling make a figure that, while it lacks finesse—there is little finesse in the author's conception—is not without simple dramatic power. Conway Tearle, as Armand, aims to express strong, youthful, yet sublimated passion, little more, and succeeds. Holbrook Blinn gives a finished per-

Amusements

"NONE CAN AFFORD TO MISS IT——ALL CAN AFFORD TO GO."
GREATEST SUCCESS EVER KNOWN "Cheer Up!" Mats. EVERY DAY Seats 6 weeks ahead AT THE
Management CHARLES DILLINGHAM Staged by R. H. BURNSIDE HIPPODROME

EMPIRE BROADWAY AND 40TH STREET Evenings 8:20, Matinees Wednesday and Saturday 2:20.
A COMPLETE TRIUMPH.—*Herald*
ANN MURDOCK THE 3 BEARS

BOOTH 45th. W. of B'way. Evs. 8:25. Matinees Wed. & Sat., 2:25. Guy Bates Post
IN "THE MASQUERADER"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formance as Armand's father, and Rose Coghlan is a spirited Mme. Prudence. F.

"WHY MARRY?"

IF Mr. Shaw's "Getting Married" had not been seen here so recently, it is probable that this play of Jesse Lynch Williams, which is produced at the Astor Theatre, might have excited even more favorable comment than that which he has received, which is considerable. It is not as clever a piece of work as Shaw's, but has pungency and sparkle. Up to the half-way point it moves along briskly, and the dialogue, without turning on itself, is full of smart quips and paradoxes. From that point on the argument is simply a varied repetition of what has preceded. After the manner of youthful freethinkers of to-day, the author satirizes the institution of marriage by means of two girls, one of whom after protesting consents to marry a rich young man whom she does not love so as to gain some independence, while the other determines to bestow herself upon another young man without marriage. The inference is that marriage may be useful to hold together two persons whom love has not united, but that genuine love is in itself a sacrament which marriage, because of the use to which it is often put, would only desecrate. It is easy as the author implies to pick flaws in an ancient institution like marriage, yet it is the best thing of its kind which man has been able to devise. F.

"BILLETED"

THE talent of Miss Margaret Anglin is exercised to advantage in this farce-comedy at the Playhouse, the work of F. T. Jesse and H. M. Harwood. Upon a widow, as she is supposed to be, living in her country house in England with a girl friend, are billeted a colonel and later his adjutant. All goes well until it becomes known that the woman's husband is still living, though apart from her. To the vicar's suspicious sister the situation is scandalous, and she starts so much talk about it that the colonel decides that upon the whole he had better leave. To prevent this the woman addresses a telegram to herself stating that the husband, supposed to be somewhere in Africa, is dead. At this point, enter the adjutant, who proves to be the husband, though his identity is known to no one else but his wife. How he wears a band of mourning for himself, relieves the wife's straitened circumstances, and in the end wins back her love, and how the colonel succumbs to the charms of the girl form a diverting entertainment which needs no further comment. F.

Finance

At the Turn of the Year

THE year 1917 will always have as notable a place in the history of the Stock Exchange as in the political history of the world. This will not be the less so because of the remarkable changes during the year in the financial point of view regarding the situation. The year began with markets declining heavily on "peace talk." It has ended with a vigorous advance, for which the cause was renewal of the "peace talk." The stock market entered the year in a condition of great unsettlement because of the German overtures. It broke with great violence on the German submarine announcement of January 31, because of the probability that the United States would be compelled to go to war.

Yet it waited with composure for the overt act by Germany which should render war inevitable, and it advanced when Congress declared war. Thereafter the action first of the bond market and then of the stock market was governed by the gradually unfolded plans of the Administration and Congress to finance the war. The story of the rest of the year was one of intermittent decline in prices, directly due to dislodgment of investment securities in connection with the Government's war loans and its plans for war taxation.

Reviewed after this lapse of time, the course of the markets seems at least not illogical. The decline, considered as an economic event, can be explained either by the diversion of accruing investment capital from its usual channels to new ones, whereby demand was enormously decreased; or by the competition of $5,800,000,000 new United States Government bonds suddenly thrown into the investment market, whereby supply was enormously increased; or by the increase from 2 to 3 per cent. to 4 in the Government's bid for investment money, whereby an equivalent increase in the net yield on other securities was made logical. On any of the three lines of reasoning the decline on the Stock Exchange would have been logical.

But it has not followed the course which the markets of belligerent Europe pursued when those countries went to war. The very well remembered incidents of that occasion were an instantaneous collapse of prodigious violence in Stock Exchange values when war came in sight, and the closing of the Stock Exchange for half a year when war had actually been declared.

The reasons for both events were the prospect of overwhelming sales of securities from foreign markets at any price and the expectation of financial panic which would cause sacrifice of securities held by home investors. The American markets last April had no apprehension whatever of financial panic; they had already repurchased a great part of the securities which were available for sales from abroad, and they knew that, except so far as public or private necessity should require, the remaining foreign investors in American securities would probably be glad to keep their money thus invested.

The real downward movement on our Stock Exchange,

Railroad
and
Public Utility
Bonds and Stocks

SUTRO BROS. & CO.
MEMBERS NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE
120 BROADWAY NEW YORK
Telephone Rector 7350

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

therefore, did not occur until the war finance plans and preparations had started actual dislodgment of home investment holdings. How far the composure with which the decision on war was itself received was a consequence of satisfaction over that decision, and how far it reflected expectation of a much less burdensome financial programme by the Government, are matters on which opinions may differ. But, since the first instincts of the Stock Exchange often have the true prophetic instinct, it will always remain a noteworthy fact in financial history that whereas the markets of Europe responded to their entry into war by an exhibition of the profoundest gloom and pessimism, our markets, at the similar juncture in our own affairs, reflected hopefulness and reassurance.

That the subsequent movement was of a different character does not alter this main fact. It is by no means without significance to recall that the New York stock market, at the outset of the War of the Rebellion and of the Spanish War, acted precisely as it did last April. It had many days and months of reaction, apprehension, and depression before those wars were over; but the first move was prophetic of the general outcome and of financial results in the longer future.

One other warrantable inference from the stock markets in the last half of 1917 is that we are not living under conditions of inflation in the usual sense. If we were, and if our currency were undergoing depreciation, then prices on the Stock Exchange would not be declining under economic influences. They did not decline, except under the influence of unfavorable war news, between 1861 and 1865. In this war prices have advanced violently on the Stock Exchanges of Vienna, Petrograd, and Berlin—clearly because of great inflation of the currency. The fact that prices, both at London and at New York, declined as they did during the war conditions of the two markets is indirect proof that the admittedly great expansion of the currency of both countries was not more than was called for by the war-time expansion of trade and increase of financial transactions.

ALEXANDER D. NOYES

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

POETRY

Tinckler, R. N. Honey-Sight and Other Poems. London: Erskine MacDonald, Ltd.
Ware, R. D. Nort' Shor' Verses. Boston: Luce & Co.

JUVENILE

Higgins, M. M. Holidays in Mother Goose Land. Newson & Co.
Twenty-two Goblins. Translated by A. W. Ryder. Dutton. $3 net.

TEXTBOOKS

Koenig, A. E., and Myers, W. R. Kleine deutsche Grammatik. Minneapolis, Minn.: The Perine Book Co.
Paris, J. T. Makers of Our History. Ginn. 80 cents.
Rendtorff, E. Drei Märchenspiele. Heath. 35 cents.
Whittem, A. F., and Long, P. W. French for Soldiers. Harvard University Press.

HITCHCOCK'S
Composition and Rhetoric

By ALFRED M. HITCHCOCK of the Hartford Public High School. 575 pp. 12mo. $1.25.

The addition of a volume to the series of widely used Hitchcock books in English composition is an event in the text-book world. This new book covers the whole four years of the high school. In the treatment of rhetoric in the last two years, there is skilful correlation with literature. In connection with the earlier composition work, letter-writing is given much attention, and there are separate chapters on Debate and on Journalism.

Henry Holt and Co. 19 W. 44 St. New York.

A NEW VOLUME
IN THE SERIES OF
Monographs of Physiology
Edited by
Ernest H. Starling, M.D., D.Sc., F.R.S., F.R.C.P.

The Conduction of the Nervous Impulse

By KEITH LUCAS, Sc.D., F.R.S., Fellow and Lecturer of Trinity College, Cambridge. Revised by E. D. Adrian, M.B., M.R.C.P., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. With 22 Diagrams. 8vo. $1.50 net.

The manuscript of this monograph was nearly complete at the time of the author's death, and has been revised by E. D. Adrian, M.B., M.R.C.P.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers
Fourth Avenue and 30th Street, New York

EVERY BOOK

advertised in this magazine (with possibly a few exceptions) is to be had in this, the

LARGEST RETAIL BOOK STORE

on its day of publication

Prompt attention given mail orders

John Wanamaker
First Floor, Old Building
Broadway at Ninth, New York

Volume One of a very important and unique work now ready:
The Cambridge History of American Literature
To be in 3 volumes.
Royal 8vo. $3.50 per vol.
Volume I contains
Material covering the Colonial and Revolutionary Literature.
Send for Descriptive Circular
G. P. Putnam's Sons
New York 2 West 45th St. Just west of 5th Av.
London 24 Bedford St. Strand

BINDER FOR THE NATION

To receive the current number in a convenient (temporary) form. Substantially made, bound in cloth, with THE NATION stamped on the side in gold. Holds about one volume. Papers easily and neatly adjusted. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of 75 cents. Address The Nation, 20 Vesey Street, New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CAN GERMANY SAVE HER OWN SOUL? HAS SHE A SOUL TO SAVE?

Upon the Answer to These Questions Depends Much in the Issue of the World War. For Light upon Them Read

The Coming Democracy

By HERMANN FERNAU

The Author is a German of Prussian Birth, Leader of the Band of Exiled German Democrats in Switzerland Who Are Working for the Overthrow of German Militarism and Autocracy and the Establishment of a German Republic. Not One of Them Can Set Foot in Germany under Pain of Death

In this book Hermann Fernau, whose previous work, "Because I Am a German," it is a crime punishable by death for a German to possess in Germany, voices the ideas of that band of liberal, democratic Germans, of their muzzled sympathizers in Germany and their co-workers in France and the United States, as to the character of the German Government and as to what must be done to enroll Germany among the self-governing nations. The American press has given it a splendid welcome, as these few extracts show:

New York Tribune: "Here is one brave German soul with clear vision, straight thoughts, and winged words; who sees the truth and tells it, and thus gives us hope that he and others like him may yet be the leaven which shall leaven the whole mass. It is

One of the Most Tremendous Indictments of Prussianism That We Have Ever Seen from a Man of Any Nation

There is a scathing analysis of the principles of German policy and of the politico-philosophic teachings of Hegel and Treitschke, of the basis of the dynastic power and of the character and genius of the Hohenzollern dynasty; but above all and through all there is an indictment of 'kultur' such as we have not seen equalled elsewhere for authority and force. We recommend the book to every serious reader as one of the foremost books of universal and permanent value thus far inspired by the great war."

Philadelphia Public Ledger: "A brilliant plea for democracy. . . . There is hardly one page in the book that is not replete with the pungent modern thought that rebels against the broken-down fallacies of a surviving mediævalism."

The Christian Intelligencer: "The book is a trumpet blast for truth and political righteousness."

Philadelphia North American: "Fernau appeals fervently, forcibly, logically to his fellow-countrymen in behalf of modern ideals of democracy."

New York Times: "The book deserved interest and welcome at the hands of all Americans, for

Herr Fernau and His Group Are Our Allies Helping to Fight Our Battles

and the fact that they are Germans, of German birth, who love their homeland, gives to their appeal a supreme advantage. . . . The book

Might Have Come from the Pen of Woodrow Wilson

for Herr Fernau sees Germany's lust for world power as the American President and countless others in the lands of democracy see it, . . . and he sees in the world war something destined to sweep the German dynasty from power and bring forth a cleansed and purified Germany."

Boston Herald: "His indictment of Germany's political system is the most trenchant, blasting, and unanswerable yet published, for the author sees clearly how its anachronisms have strangled the highest development of worthy ideals."

Springfield Republican (in a review filling a whole page): "The book forms an almost perfect sequel to President Wilson's demand that the German people find some means of expressing its will so that its word may be guarantee of things to endure."

Wall Street Journal: "Laying bare the sin of Germany,

He Pleads for Germany to Save Itself from Itself

or, rather, from the dynasty, upon which he lays the burden of guilt for the war."

Philadelphia Press: "It is because he writes in very truth as a German that Herr Fernau's book possesses unique value and extraordinary interest. When a German patriot writes such a book as this, surely it is safe to say that the dawn of a new day, faintly discerned by 'Mr. Britling,' is in very truth breaking in the east."

Newark Call:

"A Volume of Immense Virility, Passionate in Its Sincerity and Patriotism, But Unsparing in Its Exposure of German Conditions

It is the best statement we have seen of exactly what the United States is fighting for in this war."

Bulletin of the Society of the Friends of German Democracy: "A clarion call to German democracy. It will awaken many a sleeper, and will no doubt at first arouse his wrath, but

A Time Will Come When a Free German People Will Thank Hermann Fernau for Having Written This Book

It should be put in the hands of all German citizens of German extraction who still have delusions in regard to the country of their origin."

Fernau's slogan is "Onward, to Democracy!" and he calls to his fellow-countrymen: "Away from Bismarck! That is the lesson of this World War for Germany! Justice and liberty, not blood and iron, are the cement of modern fatherlands!"

PRICE $2.00 NET. POSTAGE EXTRA. AT ALL BOOKSTORES

E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY, 681 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Summary of the News

AT noon, December 28, national control of all the railways in the country, aggregating 257,000 miles, was assumed by the President in order to facilitate the coordination essential to Government needs. The congestion of freight has been one of the greatest problems, and with Federal control all competition between the various roads will be eliminated, while their resources will be made available to the utmost by pooling and strategic routing. Support has been pledged to Secretary McAdoo, appointed by the President as Director-General of Railways, by the various railway chiefs as well as the operatives. Traffic will be sent by the shortest route, all luxuries and the large salaries paid to officials are to be cut, and terminals will be utilized in the common service of a single system. Secretary McAdoo has named Walker D. Hines and Alfred H. Smith, both of New York, as his assistants.

THE topic of the week is the practical outcome of the peace negotiations that were inaugurated on December 23 at Brest-Litovsk between the Central Powers and the Bolshevik régime of Lenine and Trotzky. The Foreign Ministers of Germany and Austria, von Kühlmann and Count Czernin, have received the Bolshevik proposal of a general peace without compulsory annexations or indemnifications, with certain modifications. Through Count Czernin, the Austrian delegate, the Central Powers have made the specific statement that they do not intend to annex territories seized during the war, nor to deprive nations of political independence. A general fund is suggested as the source for all indemnifications for expenses incurred or damages sustained by the various belligerent countries contrary to the terms of international law.

HOWEVER, the feeling is current among the Allied Powers that Germany is using Russia as a club to gain a favorable peace. While no encouraging response has been made yet, it is intimated from London that Great Britain will reply to the peace terms. The threat of economic exploitation of Russia by Germany, together with a definite peace rescinding all treaty obligations, will leave the Allies bereft of the possibility of Russia ever becoming once more a factor in the war. The Bolshevik Foreign Minister, Trotzky, has delivered an ultimatum to the Allies, giving them ten days in which to accept the terms adopted at the Brest-Litovsk conference. A serious hitch in the negotiations has occurred owing to the insistence of Germany that many people desire to separate from Russia whose territories are now occupied and administered by Teutonic troops, which, it is rumored, the latter refuse to evacuate. It is not as yet certain that the results of the peace conference at Brest-Litovsk have left the contracting parties in full accord. Bulgaria has officially subscribed to the terms, which indicates some retraction of her first demands. It is certain, however, that the militaristic Pan-Germanic party has heaped recriminations on their delegates for the terms proposed as "a betrayal of the German army."

MEANWHILE no definite information emanates from Russia regarding the widespread success or permanence of the Bolshevik régime. The Constituent Assembly will meet during the next fortnight, when a Ukrainian delegation is expected to attend. The Ukrainians, who were not represented at the peace conference, and the Cossacks are still opposed to the present rulers at Petrograd. The Ukrainian division has seized the headquarters of the Fourth, Eighth, and Eleventh Russian armies in the southwest and on the Rumanian front. The Don Cossacks have reëlected Gen. Kaledines as their Hetman, thus defeating a small party that was favorable to the Bolshevik régime. At Harbin, the Russian port in China, the Bolshevik soldiers have been defeated and captured by the Chinese.

IN Germany there is further evidence of a Socialist and anti-war activity. More than 300 members of the Socialist party in various cities have been arrested, while the Gotha Conference of the party, held last April, is said to have netted 120,000 members. The new members have disavowed the military platform that split the party in the past, and the present Socialist membership has been largely recruited from women who are opposed to the war policy of the Government.

AN amusing example of the disorganization of the Ordnance Department at Washington has been furnished by the shipment of a number of draft detachments to an imaginary training camp at Raritan, N. J. The confusion occurred through the conviction at Washington that a depot existed at the adjoining town of Metuchen, where ground had already been broken. The error has been rectified in time to prevent men pouring in from the 4,000 draft boards in the country, while the misdirected drafts have been forwarded to Yaphank.

FURTHER shortcomings in the War Department have been revealed in the investigations of the Senate Committee, the latest deficiency being attached to the Quartermaster's Department, where a serious lack of sufficient uniforms has been uncovered. Quartermaster-General Sharp has admitted that the army has received up to date only 46 per cent. of the uniforms and winter overcoats ordered. The deficiency is being seriously felt at the various training camps, where sickness among the troops is attributed to a lack of adequate clothing.

THE submarine problem is still to the fore. For the week ending December 26 the British Admiralty reports a loss of eleven merchantmen of 1,600 tons, twelve merchantmen having escaped after unsuccessful attacks. The Norwegian Government announced on December 23 the sinking by submarine of five merchantmen, in which thirty sailors perished.

ON the night of December 22 three British destroyers were lost off the Belgian coast by mine or torpedo, with a total casualty list of 13 officers and 180 men. This disaster has sharpened the criticism that has been accumulating against the Admiralty ever since the two successful attacks by German raiders against convoys in the North Sea, and which has just resulted in the removal of Sir John Jellicoe as First Sea Lord. The ex-commander of the British Grand Fleet has been rewarded with a peerage for his services since the beginning of the war, and is now succeeded as First Sea Lord by Sir Rosslyn Wemyss.

AMERICAN efforts to supply the deficiency in shipping are not being relaxed. To enable the maximum amount of construction President Hurley has asked Congress for an appropriation of $35,000,000 to build 40,000 houses for the accommodation of 50,000 or more workmen needed by the Shipping Board. The programme now provides for three shifts of workers, with construction being pushed day and night.

SHORTAGE of coal is rapidly becoming a pressing problem. Great cities in the East like New York, owing to the severe weather prevailing during the past week, have experienced acute hardship and suffering. The famine in coal is also affecting shipping. Over 100 steamships, aggregating more than 1,000,000 gross tonnage, are now detained in New York harbor; among these are many munition and supply ships. The result of this acute condition must lead to Federal action at an early date. The Fuel Commissioner, Dr. Garfield, has testified to the Senate Commission on Fuel that Federal control is inevitable. Meanwhile, large cities like New York will soon be put on a card basis, until some relief is obtained by the increased railway facilities that are expected from the new Government control of rolling stock.

ON the western front the expected German drive has failed to materialize, though incessant artillery actions are everywhere prevalent. On the French front an abortive German attack in Lorraine, with patrol encounters in other sectors, is all that Paris reports. The British, however, experienced a small reverse south of Cambrai on a two-mile front, when a strong German attack gained ground at two points on this sector; this has since been dispersed. The Germans also attacked the British Ypres sector, near the Ypres-Staden railway, but were repulsed, yielding a small gain to the British.

COUNTER-ATTACKS are still in vogue with the invading forces on the Italian front, where the recent gains made on the Asiago plateau were given up by General Diaz's troops. The Teutonic forces continue their modified offensive in determined attacks at various points. The chief item of success that is to be recorded against the enemy is the defeat of an extensive airplane attack near Treviso. British and Italian airmen broke up a raiding fleet of twenty-five planes, and succeeded in destroying eleven, with large casualties to the enemy.

PERSISTENT rumors emanate from Petrograd regarding the resignation of King Ferdinand of Rumania. That the condition of Russia since the revolution has both strategically and socially affected Rumania cannot be denied, and it is reported that as a result of revolutionary propaganda on the one hand and German resentment at his defection from the Hohenzollern dynasty on the other, King Ferdinand is in favor of resigning in behalf of Crown Prince Charles.

MEXICAN raiders attacked an American mail stage at Candelaria, Texas, on December 25, hanged the driver, and looted an American store. A detachment of United States troops crossed the border in pursuit, and killed eight of the bandits. One of the American troopers was killed in the fight.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED